



3 1223 03472 6530

HIV Prevention Policies Plan Committee
 February 20, 2003
 5:00 – 6:30 pm
 25 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor Conference Room
 San Francisco

Agenda

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 5:00-5:10 pm |
| 5/S PG Guidance: | |
| n | 5:10-5:25 pm |
| n: Brainstorm | 5:25-5:45 pm |
| and Approval (vote) | 5:45-6:05 pm |
| e (vote) | 6:05-6:15 pm |
| | 6:15-6:25 pm |
| | 6:25-6:30 pm |



San Francisco Public Library

Government Information Center
 San Francisco Public Library
 100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94102

REFERENCE BOOK

to be taken from the Library

the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities.
 to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-

the Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public,
 the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other
 agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures
 that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the
 people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a
 violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall,
 Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax:
 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna_Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

HIV Prevention Policies Plan Committee
February 20, 2003
5:00 – 6:30 pm
25 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor Conference Room
San Francisco

Agenda

DOCUMENTS DEPT.


MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 5:00-5:10 pm |
| 2. Review History and New CPG Guidance:
Plans, 2001 Plan, 2004 Plan | 5:10-5:25 pm |
| 3. Directions for the 2004 Plan: Brainstorm | 5:25-5:45 pm |
| 4. Scope of Work: Discussion and Approval (vote) | 5:45-6:05 pm |
| 5. Establish Meeting Schedule (vote) | 6:05-6:15 pm |
| 6. Elect Chair(s) (vote) | 6:15-6:25 pm |
| 7. Closure and Evaluation | 6:25-6:30 pm |

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna_Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
California State Library Califa/LSTA Grant

<http://archive.org/details/2agenda2003sanf>

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

February 20, 2003

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Ari Bachrach, Aaron Cohen, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Frank Strana, and Hank Wilson

Members Absent: Tae-Wol Stanley

Professional Staff: Dara Caan (Harder & Ca), Alex (Harder & Ca), Hieu (Harder & Ca), Eileen Loughran (HPS), Tracey Packard (HPS), Mike Pendo (HPS) and David Weinman (Nate Taker)

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

Frank Strana, Interim Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:10 PM.

- Frank noted that he needed to leave punctually at 6:00 due to other commitments.
- Tracey Packer stated that Mike Pendo from the SFDPH, HIV Prevention Section (HPS) will participate in the Committee's work. He will also be a voting member.

2. Review History and New CPG Guidance:

Dara Caan distributed a document entitled, "*What the New CDC HIV Prevention Community Planning Guidance Says About HIV Prevention Plans*" (a copy of which is enclosed for absent Members) describing the CDC's requirements and the proposed assignment of sections to Committees.

- Tracey provided historic background on the 2001 Plan. She explained:
 - That the 1997 Plan Prevalence, Frequency, Infectivity, and Incidence all played a part in the formula used to determine risks.
 - The 2001 Plan simplified the formula and focused on Prevalence and Incidence.
 - ⇒ She suggested continued use of Prevalence and Incidence in the 2004 Plan.
- Israel Nieves-Rivera noted that there was dramatic change in the allocation of funding between the 1997 and 2001 Plans due to this simplification.
- Dara stated that the 2004 Plan will put SF, and all jurisdictions, on the same five-year CDC Planning Cycle.
- She also noted that the 2001 Plan has chapters that are no longer required by the CDC:
 - ⇒ The Letter of Concurrence/Non-concurrence may no longer be a requirement.
 - She awaits clarification on this
 - ⇒ The Introduction is no longer required.
 - She recommends including it in any event.
 - ⇒ And the Evaluation of HIV Prevention Efforts.
 - As this has been useful, she recommends continuing to include this section.

3. Directions for the 2004 Plan: Brainstorm

Tracey explained that part of the reason for a new plan is a changed political and economic environment.

- ⇒ She suggested the Committee explore what it wants HIV Prevention to look like in SF.
- ⇒ She asked Members to explore their vision of what should be included in the 2001 Plan through this *Brainstorm*.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

February 20, 2003

- Hank Wilson expressed his concern regarding Youth, which does not get enough priority.
 - ⇒ He noted that assigning priority to Youth should be without regard to either Prevalence or Incidence.
- Frank expressed his HIV prevention vision as operating on two levels:
 1. Addressing the existing Apathy, particularly among white MSM, and
 2. Encompassing Sexual Health Promotion.
 - He advocates this approach since regulations forbid AIDS Service Organizations (ASOs) from promoting sexual activities.
 - He also expressed that this approach would be inclusive of all communities.
- Israel suggested a discussion of a policy of "*No Apologies.*"
 - ⇒ Such a policy, he contended, would be a clear direct, straight forward, statement of the SF Prevention Community's view.
 - ⇒ He explained that that prevention community sees some of the standards set by Federal authorities as obstacles to providing services.
 - ⇒ He suggested that including this approach in the 2004 Plan would take some of the weight off of CBOs/ASOs.
 - ⇒ Responding to a question from Frank, Israel said that HPPC could '*take the heat*' for contradicting regulations, rather than the various CBOs.
- Hank suggested an integrated approach with STDs.
- Ari Bachrach noted that many populations do not prioritize HIV prevention; noting that for many Substance Abuse, Mental Health, Housing and other issues take precedence.
 - ⇒ He recommended collaborating with other service organizations and not approaching HIV in an isolated context.
- He also remarked that last year's Research Committee's work needs to be carried over to this year's priorities.
 - ⇒ Responding to Dara's question, Israel suggested continuing last year's Committee work, including:
 - Research Manifesto,
 - Mandating research being done in the DPH having HPPC's advice, and awareness,
 - Collecting data regarding Latina(o) Youth, where
 - * There is increasing incidence of STDs,
 - * Teenage pregnancy rate is rising,
 - * Interventions need to be found to address the behavior that is putting this population at risk, and Overall, looking beyond Prevalence and Incidence
 - Non-IV drug use
 - * What, if any, is the connection between non-IV drug use and risky behavior on the part of MSM.
- Hank suggested looking at the Internet, Housing and Homelessness.
- Frank suggested looking at Public Sex Venues - such bookstores and the like; particularly since they tend to attract straight identified men of color.
- Tracey suggested closing known Research Gaps in the 2004 Plan.
 - She noted that it was included in the 1997 Plan, but omitted from the 2001 Plan.
 - She also noted that this would help guide the DPH's Research Section.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

February 20, 2003

⇒ Dara noted that the 2001 Plan included a Research Section; although not focused on gaps.

- Israel suggested the 2004 Plan include a follow-up on research from the 2001 Plan.
- Hank suggested Mental Health and Substance Abuse be looked at.

Dara stated that the same sort of *Brainstorm* would take place at the Policy Plan Committee Meeting on 2/25/03.

- Hank suggested looking at People who are new to SF as well as Travelers.
- Israel stated that the Plan process should look at which groups are currently being affected by the epidemic and make sure prevention efforts are focused there.
 - ⇒ He noted that prevention might need to be age specific, such as targeting older MSM.
- Israel also said that there are a lot of populations and interventions that are not included in the 2001 Plan.
- He noted that the Co-Chairs/Steering Committee decided to "*Start Over*" regarding how HPPC prioritizes funding.
- Frank suggested the new Plan needs accommodate Populations that Emerge as affected by the epidemic in future years covered during this cycle.
 - ⇒ Mike added that the Plan should also accommodate issues that may arise, such as the Internet has during the past cycle.

Dara noted that the Committee can continue the *Brainstorm* throughout the Plan writing process. She suggested moving on with the Agenda, for now.

⇒ Frank added that if other ideas occur to people before the next meeting they could e-mail them to Dara or Tracey.

4. Scope of Work: Discussion and Approval

Dara explained that the 2004 Plan is due out (published) by March 2004. It takes two to three months for layout and printing. Therefore, the full Council will need to approve the Final Draft by December 2003.

⇒ The Final Draft includes the data, writing, language and organization.

She asked how to meet these deadlines, what is the Plan of Action?

- Dara asked if the 2004 Plan should carry things over from the 2001 Plan.
 - ⇒ Frank asked if the 2004 Plan can reference the 2001 Plan, which he noted contains a lot of detail.
- Israel noted that not everything comes from this Committee; some comes from the other Plan Committee and the Co-Chair/Steering Committee.
- He suggested each Committee Member choose two or three issues to focus on.

Dara noted that for the 2001 Plan Harder & Co. did the actual writing based on the concepts HPPC Committees provided. She asked if this were acceptable for the 2004 Plan.

- There was general consensus.

Dara distributed a proposed time-line document entitled, "*HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Proposed Scope of Work and Timeline*" (a copy of which is enclosed for absent Members).

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

February 20, 2003

- She suggested Members review the 2001 Plan.
 - ⇒ Israel added that Members should focus on those chapters this Committee is responsible for in the 2004 Plan.
 - ⇒ Tracey highlighted that those chapters are the Epidemiologic Profile (Epi), the Community Services Assessment (CSA), and the Evaluation of HIV Prevention Efforts Chapters.
 - Mike noted that the CDC has implemented SF's evaluation process in other jurisdictions.
- Israel stated that the Committee should evaluate the 2001 Epi Chapter based on whether it provides the information prevention efforts need.
- Hank asked about the Eli system, if it can provide information.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that the SF system provides much better data than the CDC's system.
 - ⇒ Frank suggesting making Eli useful as an aim for the upcoming five year cycle.
- Dara asked how the Committee would like to integrate research into the plan - as part of each chapter or a separate research chapter?
 - ⇒ Hank suggested including research with the issues identified by the *Brainstorm*.
 - ⇒ Ari suggested that a Research Manifesto - as was being worked on by the 2002 Research Committee - should be included.
 - ⇒ Mike noted that this has been discussed in earlier Plans.
 - ⇒ Israel recommended that this is an important part of the Plan.
 - Nonetheless, he suggested the Policies Plan Committee should handle philosophy.
 - This Committee should be focused on health promotion needs.
 - ⇒ Dara stated that once she collects all of the *Brainstorming* the various elements will be placed with different Committees.
- Israel stated that *Brainstorming* is not consensus and questioned if this is a good process.
 - ⇒ Frank suggested the *Brainstorm* is a good place to start the discussion about the Prevention Vision, scheduled for March.
 - ⇒ Tracey suggested the Steering Committee could get input from both Plan Committees and propose a unified vision to start the March work.
 - ⇒ Israel suggested sending highlights of this and the Policies Plan Committees' work directly to the Steering Committee.
 - Dara will do so.
- Israel asked if the Committee were ready to vote on the options and priorities.
 - ⇒ Hank stated that he wanted to see the Policies Plan Committee's input first.
- Dara stated that the Plan is the implementation of the vision.
 - ⇒ She suggested beginning by mapping out the "*Big Picture*."
 - ⇒ Israel said that looking at the proposed Timeline the Committee may need two meetings in March.
 - ⇒ Tracey noted that this Committee will send its recommendations regarding the Plan's composition and vision to the Steering Committee, who may make changes.
- Dara stated that the Steering Committee will have recommendations (*Brainstorming*) from both of the Plan Committees before their next meeting. Their input will be returned to this Committee at its next meeting.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

February 20, 2003

5. Establish Meeting Schedule:

Dara recommended the Committee meet monthly, that if additional meetings are needed they can be scheduled at the regular meetings.

- The group agreed by consensus that they will meet the first Manday of each month between 5:00 and 6:30 PM.
- The next regular meeting will be Manday 03/03/03 from 5:00 to 6:30 PM. The group will meet in the conference room.

6. Elect Chair(s):

Israel provided an overview of the responsibilities and duties of the Chair(s), including planning Meeting Agendas, reviewing Notes, attending Co-Chairs/Steering Committee Meetings, and facilitating Meetings.

- Dara noted that Chairs get great support from the DPH Professional Staff.

Aaron and Frank were nominated as Co-Chairs, and were elected by consensus.

- Frank will attend the next Steering Committee Meeting.
- The Co-Chairs may alternate responsibilities.

7. Evaluation of the Committee Process: Select Method

Eileen explained that Kevin Roe, from Process Evaluation, asked her to poll the Committee as to how it wished to handle evaluations. Among the options are the Standard Form which is filled in at the end of each Meeting, 'Zoomerang' Check-Ins, Process Led Check-Ins, as well as other non face-to-face process.

- She reminded the Committee that the process can be changed after this Meeting.
- Frank stated that he would like to have something in front of him at the end of the meeting, rather than something sent to him later - like the 'Zoomerang.'
- Aaron, and others stated their agreements.
- Mike noted that the Committee can ask Kevin for more, or less, in depth evaluations in the future.
- Frank suggested using the Standard Form.
 - ⇒ Motion was made and seconded.
 - ⇒ The motion was passed without objection.

8. Discuss Committee Recommendations to Steering Committee:

Committee Composition and Representation

Israel explained that the Co-Chairs/Steering Committee is charged with ensuring the Committees represent the diversity of SF's population, and can change the composition of Committees to reflect this.

- ⇒ The principle of diversity is part of HPPC's philosophy, although there has been discussion of how to make sure that it is more than an idea, and acted upon.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

February 20, 2003

- ⇒ The Steering Committee can, therefore move Members between Committees.
 - However, Members work better when they are serving in a capacity that fits their interests.
 - This is why they are asked to volunteer for Committee Assignment.
 - ⇒ This Committee's Membership is not diverse.
 - ⇒ An alternative to moving Members around is having Community Representatives (not HPPC Members) on the Committee from under-represented populations.
 - Israel stated support for the Committees taking tangible action to ensure diversity.
 - Frank suggested cross representation.
 - Ari stated that people should serve where they can make the greatest contribution.
 - Dara and Mike noted that if the Committee doesn't have participation from diverse populations it would be difficult to 'sell' the Plan to the various communities.
 - Ari stated agreement with the need for diversity, but added that moving people around isn't comfortable/productive.
 - Frank suggested publishing the statistics of each Committee and asking the Members - by 'Zoomerang' - to fill in the gaps; including by moving from one to another Committee.
 - Eileen noted that the Membership and Community Liaison Committees are comprised largely of people of color.
 - Dara suggested the Steering Committee investigate why more people of color didn't volunteer for the Plan Committees.
 - ⇒ Frank suggested that new Members, in particular, might not have understood the importance of the Plan Committees.
 - Israel expressed his concern with the lack of diversity on the Committees, and noted that this topic will be addressed at all of the Committees as well as the Steering Committee.
 - He also asked if Committee participation is open and inviting enough to community members and, particularly, Youth.
 - ⇒ Ari stated that Youth, in total, need to be discussed by the Steering Committee.
 - Dara asked if Members know how to invite interested community members to participate.
 - ⇒ Eileen explained that it is a simple application process, which is reviewed by the Steering Committee.
 - She noted that community members can attend and participate in meetings before their approval by the Steering Committee; but they can't vote.
 - She stated that applications are available from her or Betty.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that community members may vote once they are accepted as Committee Members.
- Other topics to be brought to the Steering Committee:
- Israel noted that people have told him that they want more research and shorter Council Meetings.
 - Hank stated that the SF School District should be represented at Council Meetings.
 - ⇒ He asked what happened to "Wedge."
 - ⇒ Mike noted that the School District used to have a permanent seat on the Council.
 - Hank added that their representatives never attended.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

February 20, 2003

9. Closure and Evaluation:

Israel served as the temporary Chair for this Agenda item. He polled the attendees for their reaction to the Meeting.

- Hank said that he thought it was a good meeting.
 - ⇒ He also noted that "*momentum*" from last year's Research Committee wasn't present.
- Alex (Harder & Co) said that she had a better sense of what HPPC does.
 - ⇒ She also stated that she thought the participants were very honest in their discussions.
- Hieu (Harder & Co) said that she would have liked to see more people participating, but that she thought it was a good meeting.
 - ⇒ She also stated that it took "*courage*" to do the *Brainstorm*.
- Dara said that there was good input and that the meeting established a good momentum.
- Ari stated that the Committee needs to follow-up on the work done last year by the Research Committee.
 - ⇒ He also indicated that the Committee needs to move quickly on its big tasks.
 - ⇒ He commented that the purpose of the *Brainstorm* wasn't clear to him, and he didn't understand how the issues relate to each other.
 - ⇒ Overall, he said that the Committee needs focus.
- Eileen said that it was a good meeting, with good structure.
 - ⇒ In particular she liked the set schedule for the year.
- Mike stated that while there is a lot of work before the Committee there is also a lot of excitement.
 - ⇒ He indicated that the Committee should include the work done by last year's Research Committee.
- Israel agreed with the previous comments, adding -
 - ⇒ The Committee needs clarity on what was, and wasn't accomplished during the last Planning cycle.
 - ⇒ It should also continue last year's Research Committee's work, particularly:
 - How research is done,
 - Where research is done,
 - Understanding what is going on with Latina(o) Youth, and
 - Non-IV drug use in relation to MSM.
 - ⇒ He suggested putting a review of last year's Research Committee's work on the Agenda for the next Meeting.
- David Weinman declined to provide evaluation of the Meeting, asserting that it is not how he sees his role as Note Taker at Committee Meetings.

(Please note: Aaron, Frank and Tracey all had to leave before this part of the Agenda, and so did not provide evaluation comments.)

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 6:34 PM.

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY MARCH 3RD, 2003 FROM 5:00 - 6:30.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran, and Frank Strana.

566
HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee
March 03, 2003
5:00 - 6:30 pm
25 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor Conference Room
San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT

FEB 26 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Agenda

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 5:00-5:10 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 5:10-5:15 pm |
| 3. Approve February Minutes (vote) | 5:15-5:20 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 5:20-5:30 pm |
| 5. Affirm HIV Prevention vision (vote) | 5:30-5:50 pm |
| 6. Plan focus groups for feedback on Plan (vote) | 5:50-6:10 pm |
| 7. Develop preliminary structure for Epi chapter,
including research component (vote) | 6:10-6:25 pm |
| 8. Closure and Evaluation | 6:25-6:30 pm |

The next meeting will be April 7, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna_Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

Plan Research Committee
March 3, 2003
5:00 - 6:30 pm
25 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor Conference Room
San Francisco

Agenda

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 5:00-5:10 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 5:10-5:15 pm |
| 3. Approve February Minutes (possible vote) | 5:15-5:20 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 5:20-5:30 pm |
| 5. Affirm HIV Prevention vision (possible vote) | 5:30-5:50 pm |
| 6. Plan focus groups for feedback on Plan (possible vote) | 5:50-6:10 pm |
| 7. Develop preliminary structure for Epi chapter,
including research component (possible vote) | 6:10-6:25 pm |
| 8. Closure and Evaluation | 6:25-6:30 pm |

The next meeting will be April 7, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna.Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

FEB 27 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

TOTAL P.03

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

March 03, 2003

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Ari Bachrach, Aaron Cohen, John Newmeyer, Tae-Wol Stanley, Frank Strona and Hank Wilson

Members Absent: Israel Nieves-Rivera

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), Eileen Loughran (HPS), Mike Pendo (HPS) and David Weinman (Note Taker)

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

Aaron Cohen called the meeting to order at 5:10 PM. Attendees introduced themselves. There were no announcements. The following reassigned members were unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts: Teresa Betancourt, Lyn Fischer, and Joani Marinoff. These members will not be considered absent due to the last minute committee assignments.

2. Public Comment:

There was no Public Comment.

3. Approval of February Minutes:

Motion to accept the Minutes from the 02/20/03 Meeting was made and seconded. There were no objections, corrections, or additions. The minutes were approved by consensus.

4. Report from Steering Committee:

Frank Strona provided an overview of the last Steering Committee Meeting.

• The 2004 Plan -

- ⇒ Intended to be groundwork and the basis of the future of prevention activities in SF.
- ⇒ Should reflect what is going on regarding the changing epidemic.
 - It is not just a re-write of the previous Plan(s).
- ⇒ SF's work will, hopefully, be a new paradigm for other areas and programs to follow.
- ⇒ The overall Vision, as '*brainstormed*' at the last Committee Meeting, was not discussed.
 - No comments were provided to the report Dara Coan distributed.

• Leftover budgeted funds (current Fiscal Year) -

- ⇒ A budgeted Needs Assessment for the current year was not executed as a similar study is being conducted by CAPS.
- ⇒ This opens up approximately \$25K for another needs assessment.
- ⇒ The Steering Committee suggested conducting research on Sex Workers.
- ⇒ The Steering Committee referred the matter to the Plan Research Committee.
- ⇒ This item has been added to the Agenda of this Meeting (see below).

• New Committee Assignments -

- ⇒ Dara stated that the Steering Committee discussed the lack of diversity in composition among the Committees.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

March 03, 2003

- ⇒ She also noted that there has been some Committee reassignment, that the following Council Members have been placed on the Plan Research Committee:
 - * Teresa Betancourt,
 - * Lyn Fischer,
 - * Joani Marinoff, and
 - * John Newmeyer.

5. Affirm HIV Prevention Vision:

- Dara distributed the document entitled, "*HPPC Vision and Plan Content*" (a copy is enclosed for absent Members).
- She suggested the Vision in the Plan Document be in paragraph form, rather than bullets.
- Ari Bachrach asked about the 3rd Bullet (HIV prevention research will be accessible through community-wide dissemination to promote knowledge transfer).
 - ⇒ John Newmeyer stated that the Community Forum approach which, was used to handle information from the "*Party and Play*" research, is a good way of disseminating data.
 - ⇒ Aaron suggested HPPC's web site be promoted.
- Hank Wilson stated that the Internet needs to be included in the Plan.
 - ⇒ He asserted that this is a leading venue where people are meeting - as opposed to bars or bathhouses.
 - ⇒ He suggested the Internet be used for information and intervention.
- Frank recommended adding a statement about technology; including adapting to trends, and recognizing emerging populations' use of new technology.
- Ari asked if the Vision could be changed later.
 - ⇒ Dara stated that the Vision would be the beginning of the Plan Document, but that it could change through the year of writing.
- Frank suggested that some thought should go into the specifics of the Vision.
- Mike Pendo said that it should include something on research-based prevention.
 - ⇒ He also cautioned that this should be balanced with something about using creativity.
- Hank suggested including something about Harm Reduction relating to both HIV and Substance Abuse.
- Frank offered including integration with STD prevention.
 - ⇒ Dara said that this is putting HIV into a bigger context of Health Promotion.
 - ⇒ Mike noted that this is covered in the 1st Bullet (HIV prevention will be delivered in the context of health promotion with the goal of creating healthier communities.)
- Frank noted that '*Apathy*' is one of the issues being dealt with in the community; HIV is not seen as a top priority.
- Aaron recommended including the idea that content restrictions imposed by funders should not inhibit prevention messages.
 - ⇒ Frank noted that this relates to Israel Nieves-Rivera's comments at the last Plan Research Committee Meeting.
- Mike noted that the other Plan committee is also working on the content of the Vision.
- Dara explained that she will put the Plan Committees' idea together and again submit it to the Steering Committee asking them what should be proposed to the Council.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)
HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting
Action Minutes
March 03, 2003

It was noted that a vote is not necessary on this topic during this Meeting.

New Item - Time of Meetings, Ongoing:

The group discussed changing the meeting time to accommodate some of the new members, who could not make the Monday evening time. Two different time slots were discussed, but the group wanted to check with absent members before finalizing a time change. The decision was reached that Eileen would email all members to see what time slot works best for the whole group. Update: the group agreed to meet the first Thursday of the month 3:30 to 5:00 at 25 Van Ness Ave.

6. Plan Focus Groups for Feedback on Plan:

Dara explained that two Focus Groups are planned with providers to obtain their view on the effectiveness of 2001 Plan documentation. She added --

- ⇒ Funding has already been approved.
- ⇒ Will send information to all funded programs.
- ⇒ Will request participation from each program
 - Participant must be familiar with the Plan.

She distributed the document entitled, "*Plan Feedback Focus Group Protocol - Draft 2-28-03*" (a copy of which is provided for absent Members). She asked for comments from the Members, and, in particular, if there are suggestions for additional questions.

- ⇒ She noted that the Focus Groups should be 1 - 1 ½ hours in duration each.
- John noted that most people are familiar with the Plan because they use it to write grant proposals and RFPs.
- Frank asked if the Plan document was intended for '*Front Line*' staff (non-administrative).
 - ⇒ In response, Tae-Wol Stanley stated that the 2001 Plan was intended to be more accessible than previous Plans.
 - ⇒ Frank stated that the document doesn't relate well to the '*Front Line*' staff.
 - He suggested adding a chapter on how to relate HIV prevention to other aspects of health.
 - ⇒ John stated that non-administrative staff should be encouraged to read/review the Plan Document.
- Dara stated that non-administrative staff could be invited to participate in the Focus Groups, but questioned how valuable their comments would be if they hadn't used the documentation.
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol suggested using the glossy Plan Summary flyer (11x14 inches) with the '*Front Line*.'
- Mike recommended having one Focus Group for administrative staff, and the other for '*Front Line*' staff.
 - ⇒ He added that both groups should be asked to come up with a Plan, rather than just responding to questions.
 - ⇒ He suggested an exercise rather than discussion format.
- Frank suggested having a '*Tool Box*' in the plan that would help staffs build programs.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

March 03, 2003

- ⇒ Dara noted that this is part of asking Focus Group participants how to make the Plan Document more useful.
- Hank stated that people working in programs are asking the HPPC to give them something they can use.
- Frank suggested including copies of the Plan Document's charts and tables in PDF file format on media (i.e., CDs) attached to the printed version.
 - He suggested programs be encouraged to use data in their own work and reports.
- ⇒ Dara noted that the Plan Document is posted on the Web.
- Hank stated that unanticipated future technologies may change prevention in the future, and that the Plan should have flexibility to accommodate such changes.
 - ⇒ He cited Rapid Assessment as such an unanticipated technology.
- Hank also suggested that the second Focus Group should have access to the results/findings of the first.
 - He noted that there are usually only two or three "*Bright Lights*" per group and in such small samplings they should have the benefit of the others.
 - Dara noted that this is not something that is usually done.
- ⇒ Frank noted that it might be useful to have the administrative staff hear what the '*Front Line*' has to say.
- ⇒ Dara stated that she would see how the scheduling works out.

New Item – Sex Workers Assessment:

Frank began the discussion explaining that the Steering Committee discussed several ideas for an Assessment to be performed with 2002 funds and they agreed to study Sex Workers.

- Dara added that two Needs Assessments were scheduled for the current year:
 - Heterosexual identified men who have sex with men, which is in progress; and
 - Recently seroconverted MSM.
- ⇒ The CAPS project also scheduled a study on recently seroconverted MSM, and so HPPC's project was shelved -- thus this opening.
- Hank suggested studying the use of Poppers.
 - ⇒ He noted that Sex Workers is too large and diverse a group, ranging from Streetwalkers to Gay Men advertising in the back of the Bay Area Reporter (BAR).
 - ⇒ He also stated that if the Council is to study Sex Workers he suggests focusing on young Streetwalkers.
- Dara asked the Committee what it would like to know about Sex Workers.
- Hank stated that he would like to have input on this project as it evolves.
- Ari stated the purpose of Rapid Assessments is to look at communities that aren't otherwise being studied, adding that Streetwalkers have been studied by a number of other projects.
 - ⇒ He suggested applying this study to the Southwestern Asian/North African community (as proposed by SWANA).
- Frank pointed out that the choice of studying Streetwalkers came from the 2000 Strategic Evaluation.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

March 03, 2003

- ⇒ He noted that other groups were identified in that study, such as Crack (Cocaine) Users, men recently released from incarceration, and others.
 - Adding that this sort of Assessment is not tactically appropriate for these groups.
- Mike asked which population of Streetwalkers should be looked at.
- John noted that Streetwalkers range by age, class, ethnicity, as well as how and where they work.
- Frank stated that Gay 'Escorts' advertising in BAR or on the Internet range in age from 25 to 40, that many of them also have regular jobs - or are on disability. He added:
 - Many in this group have regular medical care, or don't need or get it;
 - These men tend to be savvy in their use of available services;
 - It is hard to get the men into clinics, and
 - As a group, they are not well studied.
- ⇒ John pointed out that many in this group only use clinics for specific diagnosis, or as a back-up/second opinion.
- ⇒ Responding to Dara's question on reaching this group, Frank suggested:
 - Using the list maintained of these men;
 - Running ads in BAR; and
 - Contacting the "Out" advocates for this group.
- ⇒ Frank added his suggestion of asking how they access services, and looking into how many of them are "Out" regarding their HIV status with their clients.
- ⇒ Tae-Wol stated that based on his experience that these men are very knowledgeable about where services are available; adding he would rather study a different group.
- Tae-Wol suggested studying people who go through the program at St. James Infirmary who are, and continue to be HIV Negative.
 - He suggested asking how and why.
 - He asserted that this information could be an asset base.
- Ari suggested studying transgendered, Young, and/or Homeless Sex Workers.
- Hank suggested Homeless and Crack use associated with Sex Work.
 - ⇒ He suggested that some Sex Work is a matter of exchange for shelter, food or drugs.
 - He asserted that concentrating on people doing well would not shed light on people who are not doing well; that lessons from one group might not apply to the other.
- Mike asked what is known about the Sex Workers who are coping and those that aren't.
 - ⇒ He added that it would be useful to know what the differences are.
- Dara suggested conducting two Focus Groups:
 - ⇒ The first with Sex Workers who continue to be HIV Negative; and
 - ⇒ The other with HIV Positive Sex Workers.
- Hank stated that the use of Crack needs to be included.
- Tae-Wol asked if high prevalence of HIV is documented among Crack Users.
 - ⇒ Ari pointed to the Hope Study, which indicated high prevalence.
 - ⇒ Mike stated that there are several studies indicating high prevalence, but mostly on the East Coast.
 - He added that there is only one specific study in SF, and it was several years ago.
- Frank asked the Committee if the proposal is to study the connection between Sex Work and the use of Crack.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

March 03, 2003

- ⇒ Mike indicated that for researching Women and the Tenderloin (TL) neighborhood may provide enough numbers to conduct such an Assessment.
 - John suggested using person-to-person interviews.
 - Tae-Wol suggested conducting a resilience-based study – finding what is working where co-factors such as homelessness and Crack use are involved.
 - Ari suggested studying resilience and the use of crack in different populations.
 - Dara noted that former Crack users can be studied, but active users are difficult to interview and/or deal with.
 - ⇒ Mike stated that he would be more interested in looking at active users.
 - Ari suggested looking at High Risk, HIV Negative people and how they access services.
 - ⇒ Mike suggested looking at people not accessing services.
 - Ari suggested focusing on the Bayview/Hunter's Point (BVHP) neighborhood.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that concentrating on specific groups isn't well received by BVHP providers.
 - ⇒ Ari suggested concentrating on an appropriate location in the BVHP.
 - ⇒ Frank suggested interviewing to qualify those that will be part of the Assessment.
 - ⇒ Mike stated that he would talk with Willie McFarland regarding running an Assessment of people who have exchanged sex for money, drugs, or other such.
 - Several people (including Ari, Mike, Tae-Wol, Hank, and Dara) agreed that the definition of Sex Work should be those who use their body as currency to acquire drugs, shelter, money, or other things.
 - There was consensus regarding BVHP residence, although provision of services and/or working venue may be elsewhere.
 - There was also general agreement that:
 - ⇒ Screening may be used to eliminate people who have not exchanged sex for other;
 - ⇒ Asking participants where they go for services;
 - ⇒ Use of TL as a secondary location if participation is insufficient in the BVHP;
 - ⇒ Study is not to be focused on gender.
 - Dara stated that Harder & Co would try to get people to do interviews from within the BVHP community.
 - ⇒ Frank suggested using ICHO as a resource.
 - Hank noted that many BVHP residents do testing and receive services in the TL so as to remain anonymous.
 - ⇒ He therefore questioned using neighborhood BVHP people conduct the research.
 - Dara stated that Harder & Co. will write up a proposal, submit it to this Committee and once agreed upon to the Steering Committee.
7. **Develop Preliminary Structure of Epi Chapter, Including Research Component:**
- Dara distributed documents entitled, "*Exhibit 10: Summary of Incidence Among Voluntary HIV Testers in San Francisco by BPR*" as well as "*Overview of Current Epi Chapter*" (copies of which are provided for absent Members). She noted that the 2001 Plan, as well as the 2002 Update is based on counseling and testing data. She asked the Committee for its thoughts regarding what the Epi Chapter should contain.
- Mike asked if information was available from the HIV Non-Names Reporting project.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

March 03, 2003

⇒ Dara responded that she doubted the information was available yet.

- She also noted that there are no significant changes since the 2002 Update.

It was agreed that the Committee Members are to review both the 2001 Plan and the 2002 Update for the next Committee Meeting.

- Hank brought up information regarding Youth and the use of Poppers, which he will distribute to Members separately.

8. Closure and Evaluation:

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn. There was no discussion or objection.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 PM.

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY APRIL 3, 2003 FROM 3:30 - 5:00 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran, and Frank Strona.

HIV Prevention Planning Council

Plan Research Committee

April 3, 2003

3:30 - 5:00 pm

25 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor Conference Room

San Francisco

Agenda

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 3:30-3:40 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 3:40-3:50 pm |
| 3. Approve March Minutes (vote) | 3:50-3:55 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 3:55-4:05 pm |
| 5. Review Plan focus group results (possible vote) | 4:05-4:25 pm |
| 6. Continue work on Epi chapter (possible vote) | 4:25-4:55 pm |
| 7. Closure and Evaluation | 4:55-5:00 pm |

The next meeting will be May 1, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna_Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

DOCUMENTS DEPARTMENT

MAR 28 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

TOTAL P.02

HIV Prevention Planning Council
Plan Research Committee

April 3, 2003

3:30 - 5:00 pm

25 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor Conference Room
San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

APR - 2 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Agenda

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 3:30-3:40 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 3:40-3:50 pm |
| 3. Approve March Minutes (vote) | 3:50-3:55 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 3:55-4:05 pm |
| 5. Follow-up on Needs Assessment on Sex Workers
in Bayview: Make Recommendations to Steering (vote) | 4:05-4:15 pm |
| 6. Review Plan focus group results (possible vote) | 4:15-4:30 pm |
| 7. Continue work on Epi chapter (possible vote) | 4:30-4:55 pm |
| 8. Closure and Evaluation | 4:55-5:00 pm |

The next meeting will be May 1, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna.Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

April 03, 2003

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Teresa Betancourt, Joani Marinoff, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Tae-Wol Stanley, Frank Strona, Eileen Loughran, and Hank Wilson

Members Absent: Ari Bachrach, Aaron Cohen, Lyn Fischer, and John Newmeyer.

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), Tracey Packer (HPS), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: Catherine Geanuracos and Kevin (Connect and Protect, UCSF)

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

Frank Strona called the meeting to order at 3:47 PM. Attendees introduced themselves. The following announcements were made.

- Absences from attendance at the 3/3 Committee Meeting due to reassignment and subsequent late notification of time and date will not count against members.
- Frank asked members not to respond to all when replying to e-mail that does not need to be copied to all. Emails can be sent directly to Eileen and she'll relay the message as appropriate to everyone at the next meeting.

2. Public Comment:

- Catherine Geanuracos stated that she is working on a Bay Area wide project, Connect to Protect, from UCSF, involving young people (ages 12-24). She would like to develop connections with the HPPC and prevention providers.
 - ⇒ She also introduced Kevin Sniecinski.
 - ⇒ Hank Wilson asked if the project is targeted to gay youth.
 - Catherine stated that it is not. She nonetheless noted that if epi data collected indicates this to be the growth direction it will later focus on gay youth.
 - ⇒ Catherine also stated that it would be useful to share information to ensure intervention funds are not going toward duplicate efforts.
 - ⇒ Catherine can be reached at: 415 476 9622.

3. Approval of March Minutes:

Motion to accept the minutes from the 03/03/03 meeting was made and seconded. There were no objections, corrections, or additions. The minutes were approved by consensus.

4. Report from Steering Committee:

Tracey Packer began the report.

- The Membership Committee has proposed additional Cross-Cultural training, with the suggested date of 05/08/03, and lasting between six and eight hours. HPPC members will be asked about their availability and interest.
- The Plan Research Committee's recommendation regarding the needs assessment was discussed; and will be covered in depth later in the agenda.
- Jen Sarche, of the Research Section, asked to be on the Council's agenda to present updates regarding the AIDS Office Research Section. She will be on the agenda for the 04/10/03 HPPC meeting.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

April 03, 2003

Israel Nieves-Rivera added to the report.

- He pointed out that the Steering Committee also debriefed from the Council Meeting 03/20/03 focusing on youth.
 - ⇒ He stated that the overall impression from the meeting was very good.
 - ⇒ He added that there was particularly good comment regarding the presentations from the young people
 - ⇒ He told the Committee that 'Thank You' letters will be sent to each presenter.
- He pointed out that there will likely be budget cuts from both the City and State, and perhaps from the CDC, but no definite information has been received.
 - ⇒ He stated that an HPPC Resource Working Group has been formed to make recommendations regarding changes in funding; its next meeting is 04/08/03 at 3:30.
 - ⇒ He noted that a report will be made at the next Council Meeting, 04/10/03.
- Joani Marinoff indicated that she had heard SFDPH will close a number of its Health Centers, including the one in the Southeast, and asked if this is true.
 - ⇒ Tracey stated that there is a proposal that Health Centers decrease hours.
 - She also reminded the Committee that the budget is still in proposal form and has not been approved by the Health Commission.
 - ⇒ Joani added that what happens in certain neighborhoods has a big effect on HIV prevention efforts.

5. Follow-up on Needs Assessment on Sex Workers in Bayview:

Make Recommendation to Steering:

Frank explained that the Steering Committee has asked this Committee to redefine its proposal, adding that it was too broad. He explained that Dara, Eileen and he met to come up with an example for the Committee's review.

- He added that the document is not a proposal, per se but an example.

Dara Coan distributed the document entitled, "*Sample Needs Assessment Proposal April 3, 2003*" She explained that it is an example of what the Steering Committee needs.

- Dara explained that the Committee had proposed studying people who exchange sex for money, shelter, drugs, etc. in the Bayview Hunter's Point (BVHP) or the Tenderloin (TL) -- if sufficient participants couldn't be found in the first neighborhood.
 - ⇒ She further explained that the Committee's recommendation should be specific
- Tracey suggested focusing on the outcome - what is needed to be known - what would enable better HIV prevention.
- Tae-Wol Stanley reiterated that the Committee was given the topic of sex workers and stated that he does not believe it should be changed.
- He added that he would advocate for a simple, narrowly focused, but reconfigured needs assessment of sex workers.
- Israel suggested conducting a needs assessment of sex workers - MSM, or transgender - in the Polk Street Area.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

April 03, 2003

Motion was made and seconded to conduct a needs assessment with sex workers in the Polk Street area (Golden Gate to California Streets and Van Ness to Hyde Streets) involving MSM and transgender participants.

Discussion followed:

- ⇒ Jaani suggested age restrictions.
- ⇒ Hank Wilson suggested focusing on homeless or marginally housed HIV positives.
 - He indicated that other studies have shown over that 18% of that population is positive.
- ⇒ Tae-Wal suggested including women.

Alternative motion was made and seconded to look at homeless, or marginally housed, sex workers in the Polk Street area (Golden Gate to California Streets and Van Ness to Hyde Streets) involving MSM and transgender participants.

Discussion followed:

- ⇒ Dara responding to the original motion stated that the assessment wouldn't be able to explore all aspects of the sex workers in the Polk Street Area subpopulation.
- ⇒ Frank asked that it would be useful to explore if the lack of shelter changes what a client would pay as well as what the worker would do.
- ⇒ Tae-Wal commented that if information is only collected on the marginally housed, data on others would be missed.
 - He suggested focusing only on homeless MSM & transgender.
- ⇒ Hank suggested dividing the participants into two groups: HIV positive, and those with unknown HIV status.
- ⇒ He also commented that the previous definition of sex worker is too broad.

The question was called on the alternative motion. The result of the vote was five in favor and one in opposition (see roll call vote at end of minutes). The alternative motion passed.

- Dara informed the Committee that she would write up the recommendation in a form similar to the example provided and e-mail it for review to members.

6. Review Plan Focus Group results:

Dara explained that there were two focus groups with prevention providers. One group was comprised of management and the other of front-line staff. Their comments and concerns echoed those expressed in this Committee, including:

- The 2001 Plan was helpful in providing efficient services;
- The 2001 Plan was a big improvement over previous iterations; and
- The format of the 2001 was not an issue.
- Dara stated that the suggestions that stood out included providing training in the Plan's use as well as making the guide to the Plan less intimidating.
- Israel asked how the Plan was used and Dara stated that it was used primarily to assist with grant writing.

Dara distributed the overview document entitled, "*Provider Feedback on the 2001 HIV Prevention Plan March 2003 Focus Groups*."

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

April 03, 2003

7. Continue work on Epi Chapter:

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*DRAFT Outline for 2004 Epi Chapter April 3, 2003*." She explained that in particular she hoped to clarify the types of data to be used as well as determine the use of the various maps.

- Frank asked the members to review the Chapter and to note what if any part of the Chapter they are uncomfortable with.
 - ⇒ Dara added that Members' comments should be sent to her directly by e-mail, or otherwise; that detailed discussion needn't take place during the Committee's Meetings.
 - There was general agreement on this means of proceeding.

Dara provided an overview of the Draft Outline and members provided comment including these highlights:

I. A. "State of the Epidemic"

- To include trends, and information on youth/age.

III. A. "HIV prevalence and incidence"

- Incidence is the same as the 2001 Plan
- Include trend from the 2002 Update document

B. "People Living with AIDS (this is the section with maps)"

- Members commented that they are helpful
- C & T site map
- Summarize trends over time.

C. "Other quantitative and qualitative data ..."

- Include new data, including trends.

IV. Behavioral and Co-factors Research - inventory or narrative? ...

- She asked the members for direction on how to present this data.

Discussion followed, particularly on the use of maps and how to present data - inventory or narrative:

- Frank expressed his preference for inventory (table) format stating he finds it easier to find data.
 - ⇒ He added that this should be a matter of presentation, that the data should be the same in either format.
- Hank expressed his preference for a hybrid.
- Dara suggested putting the narrative in the introductory section of the chapter.
 - ⇒ Based on the input from members, Dara said that there are different audiences, and suggested a document between the 2004 Plan and the Condensed Plan
- Hank stated that maps are not particularly useful since many people do not party, or have sex, in the same neighborhoods in which they live.
- Frank stated that maps need to be useful not just graphically interesting.
- Teresa Betancourt stated that maps are graphically useful.
- Frank suggested Members review the maps in the 2001 Plan and let Dara know which ones they find useful.
- Tae-Wol asked if the 2004 Plan could include a map of where agencies and providers are located.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

April 03, 2003

- ⇒ In response, Dara explained that it would be difficult as the information on providers is captured by administrative office, and this may not be where they provide services.
- In response to Israel's question, Dara stated that BRPs can be shown by race or ethnicity for people living with AIDS data.
 - Tae-Wol stated that the AIDS prevalence map should be kept in the Plan, and that maps are useful.

General agreement was reached that trend information is useful and to use an inventory in this section and narrative in the "State of the Epidemic" portion of the introductory section.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the Draft as presented with the changes noted. A vote was called for. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Closure and Evaluation:

Frank questioned if there were too many items on the agenda, asking members to consider this and provide feedback. He also questioned whether the meeting should be 30 minutes longer.

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn. There was no discussion or objection.
The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 PM.

Roll Call Vote on Motion for

Needs Assessment:	vote:
Teresa Betancourt	n/a
Joani Marinoff	yes
Israel Nieves-Rivera	yes
Tae-Wol Stanley	no
Frank Strona	yes
Eileen Loughran	yes
Hank Wilson	yes

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY MAY 1ST, 2003 FROM 3:30 - 5:00 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, reviewed by Tracey Packer and Frank Strona.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

May 1, 2003

Members Present: Ari Bachrach, Teresa Betancourt, Aaron Cohen, Lyn Fischer, Eileen Loughran, Joani Marinoff, John Newmeyer, Israel Nieves-Rivera, and Tae-Wol Stanley.

Members Absent: Frank Strona, and Hank Wilson.

Professional Staff: Cindy Berenstein (Process Evaluation), Dara Coan (Harder & Co), Tracey Packer (HPS), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: None

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

Aaron Cohen called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM. Attendees introduced themselves. There were no announcements made.

2. Public Comment:

There was no Public Comment

3. Approval of March Minutes:

Motion to accept the minutes from the 04/03/03 meeting was made and seconded. There were no objections, corrections, or additions. The minutes were approved by consensus.

4. Report from Steering Committee:

Aaron Cohen began the report by noting that the Plan Research Committee's recommendation for a Needs Assessment was approved as presented.

- It was noted that St. James/UCSF are also studying the population engaging in the Sex Industry.
 - St. James/UCSF's study is quantitative.
 - The HPPC's study will be qualitative, based on focus groups.
 - ⇒ HPPC and St. James/UCSF will share information.
- Tracey Packer stated that the Council Meeting of 05/08/03 will focus on the CDC's new initiative, particularly as it relates to the Council's priorities.
 - ⇒ Exploration and work will be done in small groups.
 - ⇒ She suggested Members read the four-page CDC recommendation that was previously distributed by e-mail, or find the information at the CDC's web site.
- Dara Coan noted that the date for Cross-Cultural Training has been set for 07/10/03 - the second Thursday in that month.
 - ⇒ Tracey pointed out that the focus would be on group dynamics.
 - ⇒ She also pointed out that the Membership Committee is in charge of this workshop.
 - ⇒ Joani Marinoff stated that she might have a referral qualified to conduct this training which she will refer to the Membership Committee.
- Israel provided an update on the recent CDC community advisory meeting in San Francisco.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

May 1, 2003

- Joani asked about the Council's potential role regarding advocacy.
 - ⇒ Tracey responded that the Council has sometimes advocated in a number of ways.
 - She cited letters authorized by the Council regarding Needle-Exchange.
 - ⇒ Joani stated that one of the most effective kinds of lobbying is education.
 - ⇒ Tracey also noted that the Council participates in UCHAPS, which is an advocacy group, which meets again in June.
- Israel added that the CDC "*recommends and encourages*" local jurisdictions to put Positives at the top of their priorities.
 - ⇒ He noted that SF prioritizes based on Behavior Risk Populations (BRPs) and that being HIV Positive is not a behavior.
- Tae-Wol Stanley questioned how the proposed CDC guidance will affect the Care Council.
 - ⇒ He suggested having another joint meeting with them with this as the focus.
 - ⇒ Tracey noted that the Council's July meeting is planned as a "*Summit*" with the Care Council to discuss prevention for Positives.

5. Finalize structure for Epi chapter:

Dara Coan distributed the document entitled, "*Grand Plan Timeline 5/1/03*" (a copy of which is enclosed for absent Members). She explained that the lightly shaded items are completed tasks, the darkly shaded ones are in progress, and the unshaded are yet to be addressed. She also reviewed the proposed contents of the Epi Chapter including:

- ⇒ Keeping the BRP by incidence chart;
- ⇒ Rather than descriptions of all of the co-factors, provide an inventory of research; and
- ⇒ Include data other than on HIV/AIDS, such as - STD, Teen Pregnancy rates, information on Substance Abuse, and data on Mental Health issues.

Dara reminded the Committee that the *homework* was to review the Epi chapter from the 2001 Plan as well as the Update so that they could be discussed at this meeting.

Comments on Epi Chapter 2001 and Update

Dara invited comments and discussion and noted that members can make comments directly to her by phone or e-mail.

- Ari Bachrach stated that there should be information on issues including:
 - ⇒ Incarcerated populations;
 - ⇒ Populations that stretch across several BRPs; and
 - ⇒ Reasons Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) experiences high prevalence rates.
- Israel stated that it would be interesting to look at co-factors by neighborhood, if possible.
- Tae-Wol stated that the color maps were very useful.
- He added that it was difficult to distinguish the relative importance of data provided.
 - ⇒ He suggested including information on how much data was collected, noting that some studies were small, others large, and that some confirm trends and others stand alone.
- Dara noted that some "*de-tuning*" information would be available (note: this testing process identifies recent infections).
- John Newmeyer stated that consensus data should be compared with trend indications.
- Lyn stated that some of the consensus data is based on very limited studies.

HIV Prevention Planning Council
Plan Research Committee

May 1, 2003
3:30 - 5:00 pm

25 Van Ness Ave., 3rd floor, room 330 A
San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT

APR 25 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARYAgenda

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 3:30-3:40 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 3:40-3:50 pm |
| 3. Approve April Minutes (vote) | 3:50-3:55 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 3:55-4:05 pm |
| 5. Finalize structure for Epi chapter, (possible vote) | 4:05-4:35 pm |
| -Decide on other types of data to be presented in the Epi chapter | |
| -Review Timeline for Reviewing Drafts of Epi Chapter | |
| 6. Develop preliminary structure for CSA chapter (possible vote) | 4:35-4:55pm |
| 7. Closure and Evaluation | 4:55-5:00 pm |

The next meeting will be June 5, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna.Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

May 1, 2003

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

- Dara said that a hierarchy of indications by BRP could be included.
 - ⇒ John responded stating that this would be a good idea, and that the most relevant information should be at the top.
- Ari stated that references to the size of the studies should be easier to find, that one shouldn't have to dig through the bibliography for this information.
- Dara noted that just because a study is large doesn't guarantee that it is relevant.

Dara then asked how to prioritize the information.

- Israel noted that some populations are hard to get quantitative information on; such as the transgender population.
 - ⇒ He suggested including and quoting studies even with small "n."
- Ari suggested weeding out small uninteresting/repetitive studies.
- Tracey said that Willi McFarland confirms that the consensus data of 2001 continues to represent the trends in new HIV infections.
 - ⇒ She noted that there are no plans for another Consensus Meeting in the near future.
- Israel stated that the priority should be on how providers use the Plan document.
- Tae-Wol asked if there is a map showing HIV prevalence.
 - ⇒ Tracey responded that prevalence cannot be mapped because it has not been reported, it is based on estimates, and data would be inconsistent.
 - ⇒ She added that recent information would be available due to names reporting but that it would be incomplete.
 - ⇒ Israel added that ELI may also be able to provide some information.
- Tae-Wol stated that the Plan should report data consistently, or tell the user why not.

Dara suggested consensus data and indicators to be the overall structure of the chapter and asked for comment.

- Tae-Wol stated that he liked the narrative before the charts.
- Ari asked how sex workers were to be defined.
 - ⇒ He noted that many more people trade sex for money, drugs, shelter or other things than those that identify as sex workers.
 - ⇒ Israel stated that if a definition is too broad it is difficult to focus on interventions.
- Israel asked if information has been collected on MSM identified as "Gay."
 - ⇒ Dara noted that most studies define MSM as being Gay; not on how people identify.
- Joani stated that the chapter should discuss the difference between behavior and identification.

Dara asked what other indicators should be included in the chapter.

- Israel suggested including data soon to be released on methamphetamine (Speed) use.
 - ⇒ Joani suggested summarizing that Speed use is up among MSM who are seroconverting.
 - ⇒ Ari suggested asking Grant Colfax for numbers from his drug related studies
- Ari also suggested highlighting known gaps in research performed; such as HIV and rock-cocaine (Crack) and HIV and methamphetamine.
- Tae-Wol noted that there is a lack of data on how HIV affects people differently by sociological categories.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

May 1, 2003

- ⇒ He pointed out SF's uniqueness regarding heterosexual transmission.
- Tae-Wol asked if there is data on homeless people.
- Tae-Wol added that Crack should be included in any inventory of gaps in research.
 - ⇒ He suggested a narrative on how it influences the spread of HIV.
- Aaron asked if there is information on Hepatitis as an indicator of risky behavior.
 - ⇒ He added that information should be limited to Hepatitis B and C.
 - ⇒ Israel added that it should be explained that Hepatitis A is spread too easily by casual contact to be considered a valid indicator.
- Lyn stated that data on STDs are broken up by BRP, age, race, and neighborhood.
 - ⇒ Dara stated that where the information was available it would be included.
 - ⇒ Lyn suggested contacting Charlotte Kent in the STD section for data.
- Tracey stated that there is a gap in the data previously reported regarding FTM transgendered individuals.
 - ⇒ She indicated that the Transgender Community Health Project might have some data on this subpopulation.
 - ⇒ Ari stated that the subpopulation would probably be included with MSM in other studies.
- Lyn suggested including STD data that comes from HIV/STD collaborations.
 - ⇒ She suggested getting information from James Dilley at AHP.
 - ⇒ She added that with STD information the chapter should include data from the whole city, not just from city clinics and should be broken down by Zip Codes.
 - ⇒ Aaron indicated that Zip Codes do not correspond well with Neighborhoods in SF.

Dara stated that the Committee should anticipate a lot of changes in this chapter as it proceeds to the final version.

- Tracey added that there is a natural tension balancing the inclusion of too much or too little data.
 - ⇒ She added that some populations have been widely studied so the chapter needn't include all of the data; while there is very little information other populations.
 - ⇒ She suggested putting the Plan on an interactive/searchable CD.

6. Develop preliminary structure for CSA chapter:

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*Research Committee 5/1/03 Ideas for Community Services Assessment Chapter*" (a copy of which is enclosed for absent Members).

- Aaron asked if the new CDC initiative directs the priorities.
 - ⇒ Dara stated that the CDC's initiative has more to do with the Priority Setting chapter, that this chapter deals with community services.
 - ⇒ Aaron said that the programs and services not prioritized will have the highest need.
 - ⇒ Israel stated that the Plan needs to reflect SF's priorities.
- Israel suggested looking at what services are needed as a starting point.
- Dara explained that Needs Assessments, Services Inventory and Gap Analysis together are being called Community Services Assessment in the CDC Guidance.
 - ⇒ She added that the Plan Policies Committee is dealing with the Priority Setting chapter.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

May 1, 2003

- The BRP model is being kept (as discussed at the April Council Meeting).
- Priorities ranking will be done by incidence.
- The Committee is exploring how to deal with subpopulations.

Dara suggested the CSA chapter should indicate how providers deal with people and provide services, tied to BRP. As an example, she cited MSM who do not use drugs.

Dara directed the Committee's attention to the "*Sample Chapter Section*" of the document distributed and asked for comments.

- Tae-Wol noted that the BRP Category and Rank are always going to be the same.
 - ⇒ Dara agreed that only the Rank (number) need not be included.
- Ari asked why include information on funding guaranteed is in this chapter.
- Israel suggested changing "*guaranteed funding*" to "*prioritized funding*" in light of the budgetary environment.
 - ⇒ Dara will take that suggestion to the Plan Policies Committee.
 - ⇒ Dara also stated that she would propose to the Plan Policies Committee moving who is funded to an Appendix.
- Tracey suggested including an explanation of why funding is a priority, rather than just listing which subpopulations are prioritized.
 - ⇒ In way of example she suggested, "*This population is funded on a priority basis because it experiences 8% prevalence and according to .*"
 - ⇒ Dara said that explanation may not fit, or be appropriate for this chapter, but that it would be useful for service provider training.
- Israel reiterated that while no one is guaranteed funding, priorities are established.

Dara asked for a sense of the Committee and polled Members regarding the outline and concept as presented for the chapter.

- ⇒ The consensus of the Committee was to proceed as outlined, and no one expressed discomfort with the direction.

7. Closure and Evaluation:

Aaron directed the Members attention to the Evaluation from provided.

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn. There was no discussion or objection.
The meeting was adjourned at 5:01 PM.

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY JUNE 5TH, 2003 FROM 3:30 - 5:00 PM.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)
Plan Research Committee Meeting
Action Minutes
May 1, 2003

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran and Aaron Cohen.

586

3

HIV Prevention Planning Council

Plan Research Committee

June 5, 2003

3:30 - 5:00 pm

25 Van Ness Ave., 3rd Floor, Room 330A

San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 29 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Agenda

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements 3:30-3:40 pm
2. Public Comment 3:40-3:50 pm
3. Approve May Minutes (vote) 3:50-3:55 pm
4. Report from Steering 3:55-4:05 pm
5. Discuss Community Services Assessment Chapter 4:05-4:20 pm
Content (possible vote)
 - develop headings for the chapter
 - review example of one section for chapter
6. Develop vision for HIV prevention evaluation 4:20-4:35 pm
(possible vote)
7. Develop preliminary structure for Evaluation chapter 4:35-4:55 pm
(possible vote)
8. Closure and Evaluation 4:55-5:00 pm

The next meeting will be July 3, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna.Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

June 5, 2003

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Ari Bachrach, Aaron Cohen, John Newmeyer, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Tae-Wol Stanley, and Frank Strona.

Members Absent: Teresa Betancourt, Eileen Loughran, Joani Marinoff, and Hank Wilson.

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), Tracey Packer (HPS), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: None

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

Aaron Cohen called the meeting to order at 3:40 PM. He invited the members to introduce themselves and make relevant announcements.

- Frank Strona announced that Walden House would hold an Open House for the Transgender recovery program that evening including a tour and some presentations.
- Tracey Packer noted that Eileen Loughran sent her regrets for not attending, but was unwell.

2. Public Comment:

None

3. Approve May Minutes (vote)

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the 05/01/03 meeting. The minutes were approved without comment or objection. Frank abstained.

4. Report from Steering

Israel Nieves-Rivera provided an overview of the most recent Steering Committee meeting:

- The Parking Lot items were reviewed.
 - ⇒ The Committee is trying to balance the remainder of this year's agenda, with the various interests members have expressed.
 - ⇒ The Committee agreed to attempt to provide some information on Parking Lot issues this year with a variety of methods including written presentations.
- He explained that there was discussion of the upcoming forum AGUILAS is attempting to put together regarding the CDC initiative, highlighting:
 - ⇒ A presentation will be made to the Council (06/12/03); and that
 - ⇒ Members have mixed feelings about the initiative, and the seeming reality that the older approaches are being dumped.
- Tracey noted that there will be a voting item on the agenda 06/12/03 regarding the Forum.
 - ⇒ She indicated that the HPPC may co-sponsor the event.
- Israel noted that UCHAPS is meeting in Washington and will respond to the CDC initiative.
 - ⇒ He wants to ensure that he is representing the views and interests of the Council.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

June 5, 2003

- ⇒ His notes from the small groups convened during the Council meeting 05/08/03 will partly inform his representation.
- ⇒ He pointed out that UCHAPS will also be on the Council's agenda 06/12/03.
- Tracey stated that the Steering Committee as well as the Plan Policies Committee discussed how the Plan will ultimately look, including color scheme, chapter layout, and the like, adding:
 - ⇒ This Committee will review the physical parameters of the Plan at the July meeting; and
 - ⇒ The "stick out" taps used with the 2001 Plan not be used this time as they cost \$7,000
 - She noted some other methods of distinguishing chapters
 - To be discussed and decided upon in the future.
 - ⇒ Dara Coan stated that Dr. Tooru Nemoto has agreed donate cover art for the 2004 Plan.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that the color scheme would be different than the 2001 Plan.
- Tracey explained that the Cultural Diversity training will occupy a regularly scheduled Council Meeting.
 - ⇒ It is scheduled for 07/10/03.
 - ⇒ It will be the only thing on the agenda for that meeting.
 - ⇒ Tracey noted that the AIDS Office has met with consultants to conduct the program, but that none are settled upon as yet.
- Aaron asked if specifics from the Parking Lot were discussed.
 - ⇒ Israel said that specifics weren't discussed, rather the discussion focused on how to handle the quantity of items.

5. Discuss Community Services Assessment Chapter Content:

Dara distributed an updated timeline document (a copy of which is enclosed for absent members). In the future, these will be dated to provide version control for members.

Dara also provided an update on the Epi Chapter:

- A draft of the chapter should be available in July, including the placement and layout of tables, but without the actual data.
 - ⇒ The data, she noted, doesn't actually get published until late in June.

In regards the Community Services Assessment (CSA) she noted that:

- The Plan Policies committee will make a presentation with suggestions to the Council regarding a new Priority Setting Model at the 06/12/03 meeting, adding that:
 - ⇒ The Priority Setting chapter describes how priority populations are funded;
 - ⇒ The CSA and Priority Setting model must work closely together; and that
 - ⇒ The Plan Policies Committee brainstormed subpopulations and came up with the information found on the document she distributed entitled, "*Possible Populations for CSA Chapter*" (a copy of which is enclosed for absent members).
 - She added that the items found on that document are not by BRP, not in any particular order (or prioritized), and that the Committee agreed that the list should not be too long.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

June 5, 2003

- Dara suggested including in the CSA chapter a paragraph for each subpopulation (such as those found on the "Possible Populations ..." document). She asked members for suggestions regarding the list.
- Frank suggested MSM "in committed open relationships,"
 - ⇒ Including non-Gay identified committed relations; such as a married man who may also have sex with other men.
- Israel asked if there should be a division between Gay and non-Gay identified populations.
 - ⇒ Frank stated that there would be a larger data set without the distinction.
 - ⇒ Aaron stated that interventions to Gays and non-Gays are different.
- Tae-Wol Stanley asked what has changed in the proposed Priority Setting model.
 - ⇒ Dara highlighted that in the 2001 Plan priority setting model was based on a subpopulation having greater than 8% Prevalence, the proposed 2004 Plan model adds:
 - HIV Incidence greater than 1.5 times BRP as a whole; and
 - Sufficient behavioral evidence that the group is at a high-risk.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that only some of the populations on the distributed document will be prioritized, others won't.
- Tracey pointed out that the proposed model bases priority subpopulations on wider criteria.
 - ⇒ She also noted that the model would allow the Council to address subpopulations that did not meet the criteria found in the 2001 Plan.
 - She stated that these are often emerging populations indicating important trends.
- Aaron asked if there is a visual way of differentiating which populations are prioritized.
 - ⇒ Dara responded that this would take place in future drafts of the Plan.
- John Newmeyer noted that there is a lot of overlap between the possible subpopulations.
 - ⇒ He suggested that the Committees might regret opening the discussion on subpopulations, which he described as, "Going into a thicket."
 - ⇒ He indicated that the identification of subpopulations may, in part, be guesswork.
 - ⇒ He pointed out his concern that priority could end up going to where the best data is.
 - ⇒ He also said that he noticed a lot of omissions in the list distributed.
- Frank said that this model's approach is more flexible than previous ones.
 - ⇒ He cautioned, however, that these criteria only work if it kept up, as trends develop.
 - ⇒ He recommended the creation of a following-up plan.
- Aaron asked if the idea is to focus on emerging groups.
 - ⇒ Frank said that it is, specifically for tracking purposes.
 - ⇒ Frank added that while this may be, "A thicket, we can cut a path through it."
- Dara stated that the establishment of the Priority Setting model is in process, that the subpopulations are not settled.
- Tracey noted that what will be proposed at the 06/12/03 Council meeting is the new wider and more inclusive approach to Priority Setting criteria.
 - ⇒ She explained that Plan Policies Committee went through each BRP noting the concerns they were aware of for each.
 - ⇒ She pointed out that this process integrates community values, concerns, and experience with the epidemiological data which is what community planning is about.
 - ⇒ She highlighted that the Plan writing process is the appropriate time for members to express their concerns about subpopulations adding that the CSA is a natural place to

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

June 5, 2003

deal with the populations that members are concerned about, but may not be identified as subpopulations.

- Israel stated that the subpopulations on the "*Possible Populations ...*" seemed too broad.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that these are not discrete groups and many of them cut across BRPs.
 - In way of example, she added that the Plan might highlight Newcomers in the MSM BRP; although it may not be significant in other BRPs.
- Aaron asked if subpopulations that haven't been widely researched would be listed as such.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that she would put together an inventory of research by subpopulation.
- Israel noted that the subpopulation '*non-Gay identified MSM*' tends to refer to African-American and Latino men, but that some are White and Asian too.
 - ⇒ He added that sometimes African-American and Latino communities identify people as non-Gay MSM because of the issues around identity.
(Some discussion followed regarding various categories of non-Gay identified men.)
- Dara said that after she put data together on the listed subpopulations she would ask members for additional suggestions.
 - ⇒ She added that in the meantime members could e-mail suggestions to her -- by 6/10/03.
- Israel suggested that there is a need for '*Sex-workers*' as a subpopulation; not just people who trade sex for other things.
- Tracey said that the Plan Policies Committee is aware of the barrier that using BRPs when targeting populations has put on providers. Therefore, they have been thinking that the CSA should not talk about people as BRPs, but as how they identify.
 - ⇒ She added that BRPs are useful for funding priorities, but not helpful working with people.
- John noted that BRPs are about people's risky behavior, subpopulations are about people.
 - ⇒ He cited the subpopulation "*Youth*" which is only at risk when engaged in certain activities.
 - ⇒ Tracey responded that the Priority Setting model is not trying to replace the BRPs, adding that some approaches are appropriate for one task but not for another.
 - ⇒ John stated that providers need to be culturally competent to reach people at risk.
- Aaron noted that groups shouldn't be ignored just because there isn't data.
- Israel stated that there is need for a great deal of provider education on both of the CSA and Priority Setting chapters.
- He also stated that while people aren't BRPs, members need to keep their focus on what various subpopulations actually have to do with HIV risk.

Dara drew the members attention to the page entitled, "*Sample Section for CSA*," stating that it was an example of what the chapter would look like. She noted that:

- ⇒ The sections refer to BRPs;
- ⇒ Each bullet would be a paragraph explaining the issue; and that
- ⇒ Providers would apply for funding under the appropriate subsection.
- John suggested using "*Particular needs and issues*" instead of "*Unique ...*" (§ I.b.).
- Tae-Wol stated that this approach should make it easier to apply for funding.
- Israel asked if "*Also Could Be Considered for Funding Under These Additional BRPs*," might be too strongly worded; suggesting, "*Possibly Funded Under ...*"

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

June 5, 2003

Dara reviewed the page entitled, "*Appendix: Resource Inventory (Sample from 2001 Plan)*." She noted that in the 2001 Plan this was an Appendix rather than being included in the CSA chapter itself. She added that the actual data would be current when the 2004 Plan comes out. She asked if this was useful.

- Tracey noted that the data would only be current for a part of a year because a new RFP issued in 2004 to match the 2004 Plan will change the resource inventory.
 - ⇒ She noted that there is always the difficulty when publishing a service directory of the gap between the date of publication and various funding cycles.
- Tae-Wol asked how different the information in 2001 Plan is from what the various providers do now.
 - ⇒ He indicated it might be better to just publish information on which groups, or subpopulations, each agency deals with.
- Dara said that the 2004 Plan could show the amount of money allocated, and percentage of the whole, by BRP.
- Tracey said that rather than publish a list of providers and target subpopulations the CSA could describe the array of services available in SF.
- Israel stated that the appendix is a history of what has been funded.
 - ⇒ Aaron noted that with the changes at CDC it is not very useable.
 - ⇒ Ari agreed that only useful information should be in the Plan.

Agreement on this point was reached.

6. Develop vision for HIV prevention evaluation:

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*Ideas for HIV Prevention Evaluation in San Francisco*" (a copy of which is enclosed for absent members). Dara asked members for their ideas regarding the vision for HIV prevention evaluation.

- John said that some prevention efforts have been successful, others not (i.e. risk to Gay men) and thinks evaluation could investigate why this is the case.
 - ⇒ He indicated that prevention evaluation needs to pose such questions, and seek answers.
 - ⇒ He added that since the general "*climate*" has changed, it is an appropriate time to reevaluate what affected communities are doing.
- Dara suggested that part of the vision might be to see what has worked and what didn't, and then work to improve those that haven't been effective.

7. Develop preliminary structure for the Evaluation chapter:

Dara reviewed what SF is currently doing to evaluate its prevention efforts. She suggested brainstorming other evaluation efforts. She pointed out that the chapter is about how evaluations are conducted, not the results of evaluations. She noted that the focus of evaluations has been on statistics and behavioral changes as a result of intervention.

- In response to Aaron's question, Tracey indicated that this is in line with CDC requirements.
- Aaron asked if CDC accepts data that they haven't specifically asked for, and if they take it into consideration.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

June 5, 2003

- ⇒ Israel said that they accept it, but don't know how they deal with it - or if it has any effect on the CDC's perspectives at all.
- ⇒ Ari stated that the CDC doesn't seem to be swayed by unsolicited data.
- ⇒ Tracey noted the work done in SF regarding seroprevalence in the transgender community.
 - She noted that the CDC paid attention to the data and took action.
 - She noted that there is currently a lot of pressure on the CDC regarding collecting data on programs' effectiveness.
- ⇒ Israel stated on several occasions the CDC hadn't asked for evaluation data, but AGUILAS has provided it.
- ⇒ Tracey indicated that the CDC's direction seems to favor data gathering such as ELI.
- Tae-Wol suggested providers be realistic in their goals and check in quarterly.
 - ⇒ Perhaps set up quotas of how many people they are reaching.
- John stated that if they base funding on programs' historic effectiveness they could scrap everything and start over.
 - ⇒ Dara stated that data is collected on behavior, but the question, "why this behavior is taking place" hasn't been a focus.
- Israel stated that most of the information the CDC gathers is regarding process, not effect.
 - ⇒ He asked if the HPPC provides the evaluation tools providers need.
- Israel stated that the Council should ask if what needs to be evaluated is measured by ELI.
- Dara noted that much of the data collected is because it is required, not because the Council or provider sees the value of it.
- Aaron asked if the CDC ever releases anecdotal data, or is the data they rely on always statistical? He also asked if the SFDPH does likewise.
 - ⇒ Tracey indicated that, in general, anecdotal data is used as preliminary indications that a study or needs assessment should be done with a population.
 - ⇒ She noted, however, that Behavioral Risk Assessment, required by HPPC for provider until 2000, included qualitative data which was used by providers.
- Tracey noted that while the 2004 Plan will have to comply with the CDC's requirements, it should also focus on what the Council and providers need/want.
- Dara stated that she would put together specific information on what is currently collected for the next meeting.
- Israel stated his concern that evaluations shouldn't focus solely on cost effectiveness.

Dara asked for members to think about what they want the Evaluation Chapter to look like.

She also noted that draft of the Epi Chapter would be sent out by hard copy, not e-mail, because it is too large

8. Closure and Evaluation

An evaluation was distributed and the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)
Plan Research Committee Meeting
Action Minutes
June 5, 2003

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY JULY 3RD, 2003 FROM 3:30 - 5:00 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Tracey Packer, Frank Strona, and Aaron Cohen.

— HIV Prevention Planning Council
— Plan Research Committee
Thursday, July 3, 2003
3:30 - 5:00 pm
25 Van Ness Ave., 3rd Floor, Room 330A
San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT

JUN 20 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY— Agenda

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements 3:30-3:40 pm
2. Public Comment 3:40-3:50 pm
3. Approve June Minutes (vote) 3:50-3:55 pm
4. Report from Steering 3:55-4:00 pm
5. Update on Needs Assessments(possible vote) 4:00-4:15 pm
6. Review and Discuss Progress on Epi chapter 4:15-4:30 pm
(possible vote)
7. Discuss Evaluation Chapter Content (possible vote) 4:30-4:50 pm
8. Next meeting
-Discuss changing meeting length from 1 ½ hours to 4:50-4:55 pm
two hours (possible vote)
9. Closure and Evaluation 4:55-5:00 pm

The next meeting will be August 7, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna.Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

Members Present: Ari Bachrach, Teresa Betancourt, Aaron Cohen, Eileen Loughran, Joani Marinoff, John Newmeyer, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Tae-Wol Stanley and Frank Strona.

Members Absent: Hank Wilson.

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: None

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements

The meeting was called to order by Aaron Cohen at 3:35 PM.

- He noted that some Members indicated on the previous meeting's evaluation form difficulty with his facilitation. He stated that he hadn't chosen to be a facilitator, but had offered when no one else had. He said he will nonetheless strive to do better. He also said that he welcomes helpful specific recommendations.

⇒ Eileen Loughran noted that there would be facilitator training at the next Steering Committee (07/24/03 from 3:00 to 4:00 - the first hour).

Frank Strona facilitated the remainder of the meeting. He asked people to introduce themselves and make relevant announcements.

- Eileen distributed copies of "*Instructions for Administering the Pilot Survey and Completing the Survey Report*" (a copy is available upon request). She noted that the individual results would not be calculated, only the cumulative data will be available. It was pointed out that the survey is a CDC requirement. The group was instructed to fill out the survey and send it off in the stamped addressed envelope.
- Ari Bachrach announced that he is taking a two-month vacation.
- Aaron announced that he will be writing a regular column for the Bay Area Reporter on health.
- Frank announced that he is working with "100% Beef" magazine regarding sexual health in an advice column/ "Ann Landers" format. He asked for relevant questions.
- Teresa Betancourt announced that their survey is going well, and that they have interviewed 42 groups.
- Israel Nieves-Rivera reminded members of the media campaign currently running sponsored by AGUILAS.
- Joani Marinoff asked about the Community Forum co-sponsored by AGUILAS, HPPC, and others.
 - ⇒ Israel stated that it is planned 07/21 at the LGBT Center.
 - He added that an e-mail will be sent confirming the date, time and location.

2. Public Comment

There was no Public Comment.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

July 3, 2003

3. Approve June Minutes (vote)

Approval of the Minutes from the Committee Meeting of 06/05/03 was moved and seconded. There was no discussion, or objection. The minutes were approved.

4. Report from Steering Committee

Israel announced that there was no Steering Committee meeting the previous week as many people could not attend.

- He noted, however, that there was some discussion among members regarding the CDC Initiative, including:
 - ⇒ The CDC seems to be moving away from strict enforcement/interpretation of what has been discussed,
 - ⇒ They are acknowledging some interventions other than for HIV Positives are necessary
 - For instance, interventions for sexually active adults,
 - ⇒ The CDC cautions, however, it doesn't see major changes in the initiative taking place in the near future,
 - ⇒ The CDC has indicated that Stop AIDS should continue doing what they are doing
 - One member suggested suing, and it was noted that some old activists in the community have been asking when court action would be taken, and
 - ⇒ They are putting more restrictions on materials because of the more conservative viewpoint coming from Washington.

5. Update on Needs Assessments (possible vote)

Dara Coan reported on the two Needs Assessments currently going on, including their amended timeframes.

- ⇒ The first deals with heterosexually identified MSM.
 - The full report probably won't be out until the end of this year, although data will be available for use in the 2004 Plan.
 - Putting the Plan together has been Harder & Co's priority.
- ⇒ The other focuses on MSM and MTF Sex Workers who are marginally housed or homeless.
 - She noted that this is a completely qualitative approach.
 - Data will be available for the 2004 Plan, but like the first, the full report not until the end of the year.
- Joani asked if there were other Needs Assessments planned for this year.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that this year the Council is putting the 2004 Plan together which will establish priorities for future years.
 - ⇒ Ari noted that the populations under study came not from the Research but from last year's TA/PA Committee.
 - He added that the Steering Committee decided on a Needs Assessment regarding Sex Workers and that this Committee recommended the specifics.
- Frank asked if an agreement to delay release of the two Needs Assessments until the end of the year needs to be taken to the Steering Committee/Full Council for approval.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

July 3, 2003

- ⇒ Israel stated that it wouldn't be necessary particularly since the Steering Committee is trying to keep the Council agenda short.
 - As a point of information, Israel noted if the Committee's agendas must state, "Vote" if one is possible, but that it does not compel a vote.
 - ⇒ He added that if the Agenda doesn't state, "Vote" by the item the Committee cannot take a vote.
 - Dara suggested making key points about the Needs Assessments when the Committee presents to the Council.
- There was consensus that the schedule presented by Dara is acceptable.

6. Review outline for completion of Plan

Dara distributed the document entitled, "2004 DRAFT Plan Outline" (a copy of which is available upon request).

- ⇒ She noted the Plan Policies Committee had previously reviewed the Outline.
- ⇒ She described the Plan's writing is an ongoing and 'organic' process.
- ⇒ She told the Committee that the Plan Policies Committee has started its work on the Goals and Objectives portion of Part 1, I.C.
- Frank asked if there would be something about how to use the information.
 - ⇒ Dara suggested something at the beginning of each chapter about using the information.
- Israel asked if there would be an index for users to find all of the places in the Plan dealing with specific subpopulations.
 - ⇒ Dara suggested that this could be in the "Community Services Assessment" (the CSA) - Part 2, III.
 - ⇒ Frank suggested there be references to key topics and subpopulations by using colored text boxes or tabs.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that the bulk of the Plan would be printed with black and one additional color, to keep the cost down.
- Teresa asked if the Plan could be published on CD Rom.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that it is on-line (the web), but that she would check with Tracey Packer about publishing on searchable CD [Update: the DPH is researching the possibility of this].
 - ⇒ Frank stated that there could be a toolbox on the CD to help users find different types of information.
- Israel noted that the CDC wanted linkages, priority populations and interventions and asked if this would be in "Strategies and Interventions" -- Part 3, V.
 - ⇒ Dara said that this would probably be in the CSA section, including resources.
 - ⇒ She added that "Strategies and Interventions" provides definitions of the interventions, and the like.
- Frank asked if the Plan addresses other communities in the Bay Area.
 - ⇒ Dara suggested changing the chapter's name from "Strategies and Interventions" to "Strategies, Interventions and Practices."
 - She further suggested that how SF deals with people from surrounding communities be addressed therein.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)
HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting
Action Minutes
July 3, 2003

- ⇒ Israel suggested visitors be addressed in the "*The Big Picture*" - Part 1.
- ⇒ Frank noted that people from surrounding areas often choose to get services in SF.
- ⇒ Dara suggested adding a section in the chapter entitled, "*Epidemiology*" - Part 3, IV. Discussing how people from the whole Bay Area get services in SF.
 - Israel noted that at a recent conference the linkage between increase in STD and Circuit Parties was made very clear.
 - Dara stated that how to deal with people from elsewhere in the Bay Area will evolve.

7. Review and Discuss Progress on Epi chapter

Dara checked that all Members got a copy of the "*Epidemiology Chapter*" by US mail.

- ⇒ She noted that the final look of the chapter would change significantly, as it will be professionally typeset.

She asked Members present and absent to provide comments regarding '*word-smithing*' to her by e-mail so as not to take up the Committee's agenda time. She asked members to use the time allotted to discuss conceptual aspects of the chapter.

- Frank asked if Demographics re Living with AIDS shouldn't include people living with HIV.
 - ⇒ Israel pointed out some historical shortcomings of HIV data as opposed to AIDS data.
- Dara asked if the section should be renamed, "*Profile of HIV/AIDS in SF*" (page 5, §2). There was general agreement on this suggestion.

Dara asked if it the Chapter read well. Frank stated other than some '*word-smithing*' difficulties, it flowed and overall it is good.

There was general agreement regarding the chapter's overall fluidity.

Dara drew the Committee's attention to the charts in Epi Chapter. She noted that there are three types of charts to highlight the disproportional affects of AIDS (examples found on):

- ⇒ Side by side charts (pg. 8),
- ⇒ Bars Charts (pg. 11), and
- ⇒ Three-dimensional Bar Chart (pg. 15).

There was agreement that the three-dimensional bar charts were the clearest, and that the charts used should be consistent throughout.

Israel suggested that it would be useful to have where SF's epidemic is in relation to the whole country, which could be accomplished by providing rankings or the like.

- Joani pointed out that some of the information regarding ranking is found in the text of the chapter.
 - Israel suggested that this ranking be in every section that discusses demographics.
- No general agreement was expressed on this point.

Dara asked the Committee about the usefulness of the maps in relation to incidence. She also asked the Members to indicate which maps, if any, are helpful.

- Frank suggested cutting them down to only a few, but having all of them available on-line.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

July 3, 2003

- Israel stated that the maps need to be updated.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that the Epi Section of the SFDPH regularly publishes and updates the maps, including in the "*Epi Atlas*" publication.
- Israel said that overall, maps are a good graphic representation.

Dara highlighted various types of maps: "*Cumulative*," "*People living with AIDS*," maps "*By Risk Factor*" (BRP), "*Ethnicity*" (Asian & Pacific Islander, African-American, Latino and White) and that under the BRP maps were charts showing breakdown by ethnicity. She asked which are the most useful.

- John Newmeyer stated the "*Cumulative*" as well as the "*People living with AIDS*" maps are both necessary, and useful.
- Joani said that that the "*Cumulative*" map should highlight the disproportionate affect AIDS is having in the African-American community.
 - ⇒ Dara said that this is difficult to represent on a map because of the pure numbers are small but the proportion is high.

Agreement was reached that the Plan should include the "*Cumulative*" map and should reference the "*Epi Atlas*" for additional information.

Dara asked the Committee how to represent Race and Ethnicity (pg. 11-13).

- ⇒ She noted that there are a number of ways to present this information, and asked how to break the data down.
- Frank stated that some of the information is useful to some users, but not others.
- Teresa stated that she liked the breakdown in the draft as it shows the complexity of the epidemic.
 - ⇒ She added that this requires a breakdown of the data by both race and ethnicity.
 - ⇒ She also noted that there should be a category of people with more than one ethnicity.

Dara asked if the data should be in the appendix or body text.

- Teresa said it should be in text.
- John stated that if the information included data on HIV and specific ethnicities it should be in appendix.
- Israel stated that only a savvy user would know to look in the appendix, and that the Plan should be easy for the non-savvy to use.
- Frank said that directing people to an appendix could be highlighted by a colored box; as the volume of numbers presented can be overwhelming.
- Tae-Wol asked which data would go into appendix.
 - ⇒ Dara indicated that the information shown on pages 12-13 could be separated.
- John suggested using footnotes in text, so that people who didn't want the detail could easily skip it.
- Teresa stated that having the data in the chapter makes it easier for users.

Dara will work on simplifying this portion of the chapter and will show it to the Committee at a later Meeting.

Dara asked where information on research gaps should go - in the Epi or the CSA chapter.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

July 3, 2003

⇒ She noted that there wouldn't be a research inventory, per se, but that the CSA would have an overview.

⇒ She suggested discussing if there should be a research inventory at a later Meeting.

There was general agreement that information on research gaps should be included in the CSA section.

8. Discuss Evaluation Chapter Content (possible vote)

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*Evaluation Chapter Outline - DRAFT*" (a copy of which is available upon request).

⇒ She noted that it is based on the similar chapter in the 2001 Plan.

⇒ She provided an explanation of the Logic Model (chart) found on the back of the outline.

⇒ She also noted that the "*Long-term Outcomes*" are the "*Objectives*" which Plan Policies Committee is working on.

- Israel noted that the logic model should loop from "*Surveillance*" to "*Outcome Monitoring*" and/or "*Outcome Evaluation*."

- Frank noted that the logic model would confuse many people.

- Joani stated that this could be laminated and provided for members at Council Meetings.

- Frank suggested that the logic model be printed in color.

- Dara stated that the logic model should have a narrative.

⇒ Israel added that the narrative should lead them through each step of the model.

- Israel also stated that the logic model is a good description of how SF's prevention efforts look as a whole process.

- Joani suggested that perhaps it could be circular - to show all of the feedback loops.

Dara asked if the bullets were confusing.

The consensus was that they are useful.

Dara asked about Short-term Outcomes on the logic model.

⇒ She pointed out that only two are showed: "*Individual level*" and "*Community level*."

⇒ She asked if the model should include "*Linkages/collaborations*."

- Israel stated this could get too complex.

- Joani noted that DPH has six levels of collaboration.

⇒ She offered as an alternative "*Organizational practices*."

There was general agreement on adding, "*Organizational practices*" to the "*Short-term Outcomes*."

Dara will re-work the chart for the next Committee Meeting, and asked for general comments.

- Tae-Wol said that the arrows are confusing.

⇒ Dara said that she would have a graphic designer review it and make it easier to look at.

- Dara also noted that the final would be printed in four colors.

- Dara also stated that the final logic model would include feedback loops.

⇒ Joani noted that feedback loops can show/indicate a closed system and there needs to be a way for feedback to enter the system, not just reinforce it.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)
HIV Prevention Research Plan Committee Meeting
Action Minutes
July 3, 2003

⇒ Israel stated that the loops should show the way things are; including disconnects

There was general agreement on the outline of the Evaluation Chapter as presented.

⇒ Dara will write it up before the next Committee Meeting and distribute it to members.

9. Next meeting

Eileen stated that the next Committee Meeting would include work on Goals and Objectives, and that the discussion could be lengthy; thus the suggestion for a longer meeting.

- Tae-Wol pointed out that the members came up with the one and half-hour timeframe because that's what could be accommodated by people's schedule.
 - ⇒ He added that a change to two-hour meeting should be on an as needed basis.
- Israel stated that consistency is valuable rather than adjusting every month.
- Joani suggested starting the next meeting at 3:00 and trying to end at 4:30.
 - ⇒ She added that it would be understandable if some members had to be late

Motion was made and seconded change the next Committee Meeting's time to 3:00 PM through 4:30 PM; with the understanding that the meeting may have to continue past that time if agreed upon. There was no discussion or objection. The motion passed.

10. Closure and Evaluation

Members completed their evaluation forms. The meeting adjourned at 4:59 PM.

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY AUGUST 7TH, 2003 FROM 3:00 - 4:30 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran and Frank Strona.

— HIV Prevention Planning Council

— Plan Research Committee

Thursday, August 7, 2003

3:00 - 5:00 pm

25 Van Ness Ave., 3rd Floor, Room 330A

— San Francisco

Agenda

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements 3:00-3:10 pm
2. Public Comment 3:10-3:20 pm
3. Approve June Minutes (vote) 3:20-3:25 pm
4. Report from Steering 3:25-3:30 pm
5. Summary of CDC changes related to evaluation, indicators, PEMS, etc. 3:30-3:45 pm
6. Discuss Goals and Objectives for Plan (possible vote) 3:45-4:05 pm
7. Approve Evaluation Chapter (possible vote) 4:05-4:25 pm
8. Closure and Evaluation 4:25-4:30 pm

The next meeting will be September 4, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna.Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

JUL 29 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

TOTAL P.02

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

August 7, 2003

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Aaron Cohen, Eileen Loughran, John Newmeyer, Israel Nieves-Rivera, and Frank Strona.

Members Absent: Ari Bachrach, Teresa Betancourt, Joani Marinoff, Tae-Wol Stanley, and Hank Wilson.

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: None

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

The meeting was called to order by Frank Strona at 3:15 PM.

2. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

3. Approve July Minutes:

The July Minutes were approved without revision or objection.

4. Report from Steering:

Frank began the update from the most recent Steering Committee meeting noting that one of the focuses of the meeting was the Council's need to review and update facilitation leadership.

- ⇒ He added that there was discussion about the need to develop leadership skills among Council members so as to help HPPC as well as assist the various programs.
- ⇒ Frank noted the SF Leadership Initiative is planned for discussion at the Council meeting 08/14/03. He added that this is a politically motivated statement asserting that SF knows it is different from other regions of the country, and that while working within CDC guidance SF will also address local needs and concerns.
- ⇒ Israel Nieves-Rivera noted that this discussion came up in light of what's happening with Stop AIDS and program development. He added that SF's vision is to mobilize prevention in the local community rather than just implementing CDC's priorities.

Frank noted that the Steering Committee also discussed Syphilis Community plan. The HPPC will be asked to endorse this plan which deals with how SF is to reduce the infection rate.

Israel added that there was discussion regarding the Cross-Cultural Training. In summary, he indicated that the response was very positive.

- ⇒ He highlighted one of the observations of the training was that meeting facilitators need to proactively encourage quiet members to participate in discussions.
- Some discussion followed regarding evaluation forms wrapping up the program.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

August 7, 2003

- Eileen added that the Cross-Cultural Training would be discussed in more depth at the Council meeting 08/14/03.

5. Summary of CDC changes related to evaluation, indicators, PEMS, etc.:

Dara Coan introduced Charles Klein who was invited to help explain some of the CDC's evaluation indicators. Charles distributed the document entitled, "*HIV Prevention Program Performance Indicators*," a copy of which is available upon request. Some of the highlights of Charles' presentation included the following.

- ⇒ The current administration in Washington is particularly interested in quantifying funded programs' activities.
 - The CDC has therefore established Performance Indicators (PI's).
- ⇒ There are 20 PI's, as detailed in the document distributed.
 - An additional three PI's relate only to jurisdictions participating in supplemental funding for perinatal transmission (not SF).
- ⇒ Few of the PI's are based on results or outcomes of interventions.
 - Rather the PI's provide numbers; i.e. number of targeted population actually *reached* by specific interventions? (Emphasis added.)
- ⇒ Each area of HIV prevention will have specific PI's.
- ⇒ The Cooperative Agreement is comprised of Goals and Objectives.
 - SF HIV prevention efforts will be evaluated based on improvements to established baselines for each Goal and Objective.
 - Improvement over baselines measured by the 20 PI's.
- ⇒ The SFDPH will have a conduct a meeting on Tuesday the 12th at 3:00 PM to help establish baselines, 25 Van Ness.
 - Baselines can revised over the next two years.
- ⇒ The CDC has been fairly explicit in their requirements regarding PI's.
- ⇒ There is some question as to the consequences of PI's, and it is unclear the extent of correlation between PI's and funding.
- ⇒ There is also some question regarding the implications of the interpretations of data collected; i.e. how many outreach contacts does it take to get someone into service - which has a direct bearing on any measurement of outreaches' efficaciousness.
 - Dara noted that PI's don't actually measure if programs are working.
 - She suggested SF also collect information that the Council finds useful in determining programs' efficacy.
- ⇒ The CDC will be proposing new Program Evaluation Monitoring (PEM).
 - SF implemented the ELI system to collect and monitor client-level data and demographics.
- ⇒ CDC is developing a PEM for those jurisdictions that didn't join the ELI initiative.
 - In theory, SF may continue to use ELI as long as the data is '*transferable*' to PEMS.
 - The extent of compatibility between ELI and PEM is as yet unclear.

Some discussion of the CDC's changes regarding evaluation as well as the 2004 Plan's Evaluation chapter followed.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

August 7, 2003

- Israel noted that PEMS is more about process, ELI about demographics.
- Dara stated that PEMS would ultimately be expanded to include PI's.
- Frank noted that some programs' data in ELI data is filtered in such a way as to jeopardize qualifications, and that various programs may employ different data capture criteria/protocols.
- Israel highlighted one of the oddities in data collection protocol: a MSM who hasn't had sex with a man in 12 months gets reclassified as a MSF.
 - ⇒ He added that by doing so you don't see interventions' success.
 - ⇒ Charles responded that it is important to track people who are responding to intervention.
 - ⇒ Israel added that since many interventions predate ELI their continuing efficacy is lost in the system skewing PI's to a negative view.
 - ⇒ Frank suggested adding category such as "*chosen abstinence*" and the like to indicate an intervention's positive effect past the 12-month period of initial change in behavior.
 - ⇒ Charles noted that the CDC doesn't want to know if the client abstained from risky behavior.
 - He added that the data the CDC wants to measure is - did the targeted population go to service?
 - ⇒ Dara suggested the Council not limit its data collection to the CDC's indicators.
- Charles noted that LA integrates care and prevention data.
- Frank said that his agency, and probably others, has to manually interpret data to establish client satisfaction.
- Israel suggested in the Logic Model evaluation (or looping back) needs to be shown.
- John Newmeyer, in response to Frank's solicitation of his opinion, said that he felt better about HIV prevention in the 80's when the core of the program was to reduce risky behavior.
 - ⇒ John also said that HIV prevention has been disappointing, particularly as regards gay men since the late 90's, that he is alarmed by the increase in infection rates.
 - He stated that based on this increase among gay men it could easily be said that HIV prevention tactics have failed.
 - ⇒ He added that he has a grudging sympathy for any effort that supports programs that actually work.
 - ⇒ He suggested asking people who have recently sero-converted what could have been done to alter their behavior.
 - Dara noted that there is a similar such study currently in process.
- Israel suggested developing a vision of what evaluation would look like if it were to be useful in SF.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that there is a vision in the chapter, but that it doesn't go into detail on specific indicators.
- In response to a request from Aaron Cohen, Charles will forward the URL (Internet address) for the CDC guidance involved in the SF Cooperative Agreement.
- Frank suggested changing the Evaluation chapter to ensure the evaluation process doesn't look like a new system

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

August 7, 2003

6. Discuss Goals and Objectives for the Plan:

Dara provided an overview of the current draft of this chapter.

- She pointed out that the chapter is collaborative and is, therefore, still in process.
 - ⇒ She noted that the Community Liaison and Plan Policies committees have already reviewed it, but that the Membership committee has yet to review it.
- She added that the other committees suggested keeping it simple, unlike in the 2001 Plan.
- John and Frank both noted that the percentages in Objectives 2-4 are nearly impossible since the incidence has already been so drastically reduced.
 - ⇒ Dara will ask Willi McFarland to review and provide guidance on the statistics used.
- John asked if the IDU numbers included MSM IDU, and was told that they do.
- Frank suggested using reducing to "*an acceptable level*."
- Israel asked if the Goals and Objectives are intended to match CDC's indicators or if they are SF's own, "*Lofty goals*:"
 - ⇒ Dara responded that this chapter should reflect SF's own "*Lofty goals*" not CDC requirements.
 - ⇒ She added this is the vision of where SF HIV Prevention sees itself as going.
- Frank suggested making the last strategy a priority.
- Israel stated that this chapter should be more than a hope, it is what the Council's vision is based on.
- Frank asked if the term "*wellness*" could/should be included.
- Israel suggested including the idea of "*health promotion*" insofar as addressing the connections between factors and influences.
- Dara noted that the document would ultimately go to the Steering committee where it will be voted on and, if approved, submitted to the Council.
- Dara asked if there is consensus in the Committee on the chapter and the members indicated that there was general agreement.

7. Approve Evaluation Chapter:

Dara distributed a draft of the Evaluation Chapter ("*Draft 1- for review by Plan Research Committee*") a copy of which is available upon request. She asked members to review and provide comment.

- Frank stated that the Logic Model seems incomplete without the arrows
 - ⇒ Dara pointed out it is a draft, and that colors as well as many of the graphic elements - including arrows - need to be added.
- Israel suggested that the overview needs to explain that evaluation is an ongoing process
- Dara proposed adding a "*How to use this chapter*" section.
- Israel noted that in communities of color the word, "*evaluation*" has a negative connotation.
 - ⇒ He suggested the introduction should explain how evaluations could be helpful to programs.
- Frank suggested adding something about how the evaluation process can be successful, citing IDU
- Dara suggested putting some of the detail in appendix rather than the text of the chapter.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

August 7, 2003

- ⇒ There was general agreement on this idea.
- John suggested having Consensus meeting every three years, noting that the last was clearly helpful to the entire prevention community.

Dara drew the committee's attention to "The HPPC's Guiding Principles for Research" (Exhibit 2, page 8) and asked for members feedback.

- ⇒ Israel noted that part of the principle is the researchers' responsibility to community, which isn't clearly articulated.

Discussion followed regarding the Logic Model, including the following.

- Frank suggested bringing the model forward as a logo for the chapter.
- Israel reiterated the need to show the evaluation process as part of the model.
- Dara asked if the CDC indicators should be included.
 - ⇒ The consensus was that they should.
- Dara asked if baselines (as discussed above) should be included.
 - ⇒ The consensus was that they should not.

Dara asked the committee how to proceed with this chapter.

- Frank suggested reviewing the chapter again at the next Committee meeting, after members have had a chance to read and think about the chapter.
- There was general agreement on this proposed process.

Dara noted that she is swamped; but that at next meeting she would provide the next draft of both the Evaluation and Epi chapters.

- As regards the Epi Chapter; Dara noted that the Committee had agreed on all of what need to be included in the bibliography.
 - ⇒ She noted that the bibliography will reach 50+ pages, particularly with all of the specified detail including references from all chapters.
 - ⇒ She suggested citing the studies in the Plan document and having a separate volume for the bibliography for those that requested that detail.
 - She pointed out that not everyone would need or want this volume.
 - ⇒ There was general agreement to proceed in this fashion.

8. Closure and Evaluation

Members completed their evaluation forms. The meeting adjourned at 4:45 PM.

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY SEPTEMBER 4TH, 2003 FROM 3:00 - 5:00 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran and Frank Strona.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

August 7, 2003

HIV Prevention Planning Council

Plan Research Committee

Thursday, September 4, 2003

3:00 - 5:00 pm

25 Van Ness Ave., 3rd Floor, Room 330A

San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

AUG 28 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Agenda

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 3:00-3:10 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 3:10-3:20 pm |
| 3. Approve August Minutes (vote) | 3:20-3:25 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 3:25-3:30 pm |
| 5. Approve EPI chapter (possible vote) | 3:30-3:50 pm |
| 6. Approve Evaluation Chapter (possible vote) | 3:50-4:05 pm |
| 7. Discuss Cover for Plan (possible vote) | 4:05-4:15 pm |
| 8. Review Plan timeline for rest of year | 4:15-4:20 pm |
| 9. Discuss HPPC presentation (possible vote) | 4:20-4:25 pm |
| 10. Closure and Evaluation | 4:25-4:30 pm |

The next meeting will be October 2, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna.Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

September 4, 2003

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Eileen Loughran, Joani Marinoff, John Newmeyer, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Tae-Wol Stanley, Frank Strona and Hank Wilson.

Members Absent: Ari Bachrach, Teresa Betancourt, and Aaron Cohen.

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: Vincent Fuqua - DPH, and Joe Imbriani - DPH.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

The meeting was called to order by Frank Strona at 3:07 PM. He invited attendees to introduce themselves and make any relevant announcements. There were no announcements

2. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

3. Approve July Minutes:

The August Minutes were approved without revision or objection. Hank Wilson and Tae-Wol abstained.

4. Report from Steering:

Israel provided an overview of the matters dealt with at the last Steering Committee meeting.

1. The agenda for the next Council meeting 9/11, which will include:
 - Council's review of the Priority Setting Model to be used in the 2004 Plan. This will be presented by the Plan Policies Committee.
 - Dara and Gwen will presentation an overview of the SCAN results from the Bayview and Tenderloin. The Council will then break into small groups to discuss next steps.
 - * Dara will give the presentation including responses from neighborhood people,
 - * This data will be presented separately by neighborhood because the findings are very different.
 - The Cooperative Agreement is also on the agenda. The Council members are going to vote to approve the final document at this meeting.
2. The Parking Lot, including discussion on how to deal with the queue of issues during a plan writing year and within the agreed upon Council meeting three-hour format.
 - He highlighted that although the Parking Lot will not be on the agenda, it is not being ignored.
3. The Process Evaluation data from the last Council meeting in which two things issues stood out:
 - a) The reported grins on Co-chairs' faces (smirks) during the meeting; although the observation didn't reference to any particular issue(s).
 - b) Uneven Member participation in the Council's proceedings.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

September 4, 2003

- * Israel noted the suggestion that committee Co-Chairs mentor their Members encouraging those who participate in committee discussions to do so at the full Council.
 - * He also noted the suggestion that people make their comments specific on the Evaluation Forms.
4. The Leadership Initiative was discussed including bringing agencies into direct funding so that others can use local funding.
- The Steering Committee will decide what the Leadership Initiative actually is, and ask the Plan Policies Committee to write it up for the 2004 Plan document.

Some general discussion followed.

- Frank noted that there was also a suggestion for people to go to Katherine Roe about an issue if they are uncomfortable going directly to a Co-Chair.
- Hank asked if there are new developments on Rapid Testing.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that SF could be getting a grant for partner testing of perhaps \$300K.
 - ⇒ Tracey noted that DPH is purchasing supplies for Rapid Testing.
 - ⇒ Israel also stated that Glide is doing a pilot program.
 - ⇒ Frank added that later this year Walden House would be updating its counselor training.
 - ⇒ Israel pointed out that Rapid Testing requires a lot of backup planning in case of a positive test result.
 - In way of example, Frank added that in a small agency a single counselor could get four or five positives in a row, which would make scheduling very difficult. A concern was also raised about confirmatory testing using Orasure. Many smaller agencies do not have a trained phlebotomist on staff.

5. Approve EPI chapter

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*Pending Changes to Epi Chapter, September 4, 2003.*"

- ⇒ She asked that word-smithing be handled directly with her.
- ⇒ She noted that cofactors would be explored in the CSA chapter, as previously agreed.

A number of issues were discussed, as follows:

Discussion Regarding Neighborhood Data

- John Newmeyer asked about validity of the data regarding neighborhoods.
 - ⇒ At one time, John noted, this number was calculated by taking the number diagnosed and subtracting the people who die within a specific neighborhood to come up with the number living with AIDS in that neighborhood.
- Dara indicated that this is one of the ways that the statistic is arrived at.
- John asserted this is a serious issue with highly questionable reliability.
- Israel stated this would be critical if the Council based its recommendations for funding on neighborhood data; but, he pointed out, it doesn't.
 - ⇒ He added that neighborhood data is really just given as an overview of SF.
- Dara added that this is AIDS, not HIV data.
- Frank stated that he is uncomfortable with the validity of the neighborhood data, suggesting removing the present section and adding a narrative in the introduction.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

September 4, 2003

- ⇒ Unless the Committee knows the data is current, he added, it should be taken out.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that there is an Atlas of people living with AIDS that could be referenced.
 - ⇒ Frank noted that this section does agencies a disservice if the data isn't recent and/or reliable.
 - Dara stated her surprise that in the Mission people living with AIDS are largely non-Latino.
 - Dara proposed keeping only recent data in the chapter.
 - ⇒ She also proposed adding sections to the CSA chapter regarding traditionally highly impacted neighborhoods - Castro, Tenderloin, Western Addition, and Bayview.
- The Committee agreed to Dara's proposals.

Discussion of Drug Use Epidemiology

- Hank asked why statistical data regarding drug use isn't in the Epidemiology chapter, but is rather relegated to the CSA chapter.
 - ⇒ The CSA he asserted is not the relevant chapter, or it should be in both.
 - ⇒ If the percentages of people using different drugs is known, he added, "*That's epidemiology.*"
- Dara responded that the CSA is the name given by CDC, but that it really functions as a Needs Assessment chapter.
 - ⇒ The reasons the Committee decided to put the drug use information in the CSA, she noted, was so that it wouldn't be in the Plan twice.
 - ⇒ If drug use is discussed in two places, she asked, why not other factors.
- Israel said that CSA is not meant to replace other chapters but that it is also not meant to duplicate information.
 - ⇒ He added that the Committee doesn't want the document to be 500 pages again.

Discussion of Epidemic/Endemic & Priorities

- Israel suggested using the concepts introduced by Willi McFarland at a recent Council presentation wherein populations are categorized as
 - "*Epidemic*" - the infection rate is accelerating;
 - "*Endemic*" - the infection is growing slowly, but enough to maintain a level of infection indefinitely; and
 - "*Not Epidemic*" - meaning that either there is no infection, or the rate of growth is slow enough that the infected population is shrinking in size.
- ⇒ He pointed out that this is essentially the way the HPPC prioritizes.
 - While the Council is committed to inclusion, he added, the priorities must be about dealing with high-risk behavior.
- Israel stated that his recollection of Willi's model indicates that women are "*Not Epidemic*", but that African-American women are "*Epidemic*."
 - ⇒ Tracey noted that the African-American female population is "*Endemic*" as infection rates are continuing, not going up.
- Israel suggested the Plan address why HPPC prioritizes as it does, including some graphics that really highlight who is at high-risk.
 - ⇒ This chapter, he added, needs to be a tool for communities and providers to understand this approach.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

September 4, 2003

- Tae-Wol cautioned against using epidemiological terms like, "*Epidemic and Endemic*," as they are not helpful and present a barrier to many readers.
 - ⇒ Why the HPPC prioritizes as it does, he continued, needs to be explained in a way that is understandable.
 - ⇒ He recommended explaining more about the way priorities are established.
- Tae-Wol asserted that next year is really about concentrating on the most at-risk people, as well as refocusing funding.
 - ⇒ The Council and the providers, he added, know who is at risk and who should be tested.
- Joani Marinoff said that the Plan needs to explain that while there is some infection in certain communities - i.e., African-American woman - there are other groups in which infection is much more widespread and the people have much more risk.
 - ⇒ The Plan, she emphasized, needs to explain this in non-scientific terms so that people understand that they are not being ignored, but priorities need to be set.
- Joani noted that she doesn't believe that the Committee has adequate data on women.
 - ⇒ Many women, she explained, are transient in the Bay Area and perhaps that's why they are being affected.
 - ⇒ Women are also impacted, she added, by cofactors such as homelessness.
 - ⇒ Needle sharing, she pointed out, is more common among women.
 - ⇒ She suggested emphasizing that this information is what we know now, but that it changes.

Race and Ethnicity

Dara brought up the charts on race and ethnicity reminding the Committed that a decision on this topic was previously deferred.

- Israel stated that the charts were useful
- Dara proposed retaining the charts and including the nation of origin.

The Committee agreed to retain the charts on Race and Ethnicity, including information on the nation of origin.

Incidence Numbers

Dara then asked if the incidence numbers should they be rounded.

- John said that those with significant digits should be rounded.

The Chapter in General

- John noted that on pages 4-5 of the draft EPI chapter regarding the high cost of living in SF and seroconversion, that the connection is not clear.
 - ⇒ A good number of privileged people, he pointed out, have been seroconverting.
- Tracey noted that this chapter is about what data we have, not what it is about or what the Prevention community is doing about it. There are other chapters dealing with that.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that explaining what actions are being taken should be included in the CSA chapter.
 - ⇒ The CSA chapter, Tracey stated, is a richer chapter insofar as it provides the meaning whereas the Epi chapter presents the data.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

September 4, 2003

- Dara said that data might not be available regarding trends and needle sharing, but that it can be mentioned in the narrative.
- Dara suggested that the homelessness issue could be narrated in the CSA chapter.
- Dara asked what to do with populations that are disproportionately affected.
 - ⇒ Israel suggested that while such populations need to be highlighted, it should be kept in context of the whole.
 - It needs to be made clear, he stated, that when a population is highlighted it doesn't mean others are ignored.
 - ⇒ Israel added that he would be comfortable having this explained in the CSA.
- Joani added that there should be cross-references from CSA to other chapters.
- Dara noted that unlike previous Plans the EPI chapter is supporting data, not the center.
- Joani noted that 25% of SF has Limited English Proficiency (LEP).

Motion was made and seconded to accept chapter as presented with the changes noted above. The motion carried without objection or abstention.

6. Approve Evaluation Chapter

Dara distributed the document entitled, "2004 San Francisco HIV Prevention Plan, Chapter x: Evaluation" a copy of which is available upon request.

- Israel suggested the Council form an Evaluation Committee next year.
 - ⇒ The Council needs to recognize how important evaluation is, he contended, and needs to generate a positive buzz about the processes involved.
 - ⇒ Joani stated that the Evaluation process could be empowering.
- Dara highlighted the changes she made to the chapter (Redline version distributed with changes underlined).
- Frank stated that if the chapter were, "Punched up" it could have a positive effect.
 - ⇒ He added that he is not keen on the use of the word, "Empowerment" and suggested getting a marketing person involved.
- Hank stated that the dynamic nature of the epidemic requires ongoing evaluation.
- Tae-Wol stated he liked the word, "Integral."
- Joani noted that in this time of diminishing resources evaluation takes on a greater significance to both funders and providers.
 - ⇒ The chapter should cite an example, she proposed, of how good evaluation methodology benefits providers.
 - ⇒ She suggested setting this success story off graphically, such as by using a text box.
- Israel stated that he would like to continue to be able to contradict the CDC when they say that health education efforts are ineffective.
 - ⇒ To do that effectively, he pointed out, requires sound evaluation processes.
 - ⇒ Joani suggested doing just that could be a highlighted 'story.'
- Dara stated that what is needed is to shift the way people look at evaluation.
- Tracey noted that ELI is only part of the evaluation process.
 - ⇒ The prevention community, she added, needs to ask itself what it wants to get out of the whole process.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

September 4, 2003

- Frank noted that while this is a challenge it should be presented as a positive tool - certainly not that it is reliant on ELI.
- Israel stated that the 2004 Plan is for the whole community, and the Committee should first look at what the SF community wants/needs for an evaluation process.
 - ⇒ ELI is the DPH process, he asserted, and other funders may mandate yet other systems.
 - ⇒ The Council, he urged, needs for its own purposes to have stronger evaluation processes.
- Dara summarized the changes in the Evaluation chapter:
 - ⇒ A box with an example of how the evaluation process benefits prevention efforts,
 - ⇒ Narrative emphasizing that the epidemic is dynamic and that evaluation is the method by which the prevention community reacts to changing needs,
 - ⇒ Highlight that ELI is just a portion of the process.
- Israel suggested making community evaluation a priority for 2003.
- John stated that this is a very good section.

Motion to accept the chapter with changes was made and seconded. No objection, or abstentions, the motion passed.

The CSA Chapter

Dara noted that that the writers are struggling with the CSA. In particular these two issues are contentious.

- ⇒ What should be the intervention priority by BRP, and
- ⇒ What should be the research priority.

7. Discuss Cover for Plan

Tracey stated that DPH professional staff and Dara met with a new group of consultants to help with the Plan's cover, as well as with the use of color and possibly tabs. The consultants' approach seems to be less intimidating than past efforts. We will be getting a proposal from the contractors in the near future. The committee agreed to revisit this item upon acceptance of a proposal.

8. Review Plan timeline for rest of year

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*DRAFT Timeline for Presentation of Plan Chapters to HPPC, August 28, 2003.*" She highlighted that both this and the Plan Policies committee will make presentations in October, which is why the review votes were needed of Epidemiology and Evaluation chapters at this meeting.

- ⇒ She noted that this is a heavy schedule; but is similar to what was done in 2001.
- ⇒ She also reminded the Committee why the schedule calls for completion this year: the Plan needs to be delivered by April so that providers can respond to RFPs for 2005.
 - The mechanical work of typesetting, printing and all requires the completed text, she added, by the end of December 2003 to have a completed document by April.
 - It was also noted that the Council's new term begins in January.
- Israel reminded the Committee that there will be seven new Council Members at November's meeting and he cautioned against intimidating them.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

September 4, 2003

- ⇒ Frank suggested making a recommendation to the Membership committee that they integrate an explanation of the Plan writing process into the new Members' orientation materials.
- ⇒ Tracey stated that it is good that the Committee is discussing this now, so as to give the Membership Committee time to prepare orientation materials.

Mentors to New Council Members

- Joani suggested assigning a mentor to each new member.
 - ⇒ Tracey stated that this has been done before and people complained that it was too formal, but we can do it again.
 - ⇒ In the past, Tracey added, part of the difficulty has been that mentors weren't prepared to take on the whole responsibility of what they volunteered for.
 - ⇒ Israel said that part of what a mentor should do includes going to committee meetings with new members and sitting next to them at council meeting.
 - ⇒ Joani volunteered to mentor, if the program is restarted.

9. Discuss HPPC presentation

Dara noted that the Committee would make presentation to the Council at the October meeting (10/09/03). The hope is that Committee members would receive a copy of the Epidemiology and Evaluation chapters before the meeting so that they can discuss any difficulties with Dara.

- Tae-Wol and Joani volunteered to do the presentation.
- Frank stated that he is concerned that Council Members actually review the chapter before the meeting, and that they don't rely on the presentation.
- Israel suggested Betty sending around a reminder, and Gwen or Israel making announcement at September Council meeting (09/11/03).
- Tracey suggesting making sure people understand how important it is to read the chapter before the meeting.
 - ⇒ It might be helpful, she suggested, having a "*How to read the chapters*" note or memo.
- Israel stated that this needs to be taken to the Steering Committee.
- Dara asked if Committee wants a copy of the presentation before the meeting.
 - ⇒ Eileen noted that the next Committee meeting is 10/02/03 and the Members can review the presentation then.
- Joani asked what was the worst that could happen at the presentation.
 - ⇒ She was told that the chapters could be sent back to Committee.

10. Closure and Evaluation

Frank said that he could be contacted directly anyone wants to make comment outside of the process evaluation form.

Evaluation forms were distributed and the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY OCTOBER 2ND, 2003 FROM 3:00 - 5:00 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran and Frank Strona.

HIV Prevention Planning Council
Plan Research Committee
Thursday, October 2, 2003
3:00 - 5:00 pm
25 Van Ness Ave., 3rd Floor, Room 330A
San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEP

SEP 25 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Agenda

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 3:00-3:10 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 3:10-3:20 pm |
| 3. Approve September Minutes (vote) | 3:20-3:25 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 3:25-3:30 pm |
| 5. Committee Co-chair election (vote) | 3:30-3:35 pm |
| 6. Discuss CSA Chapter (possible vote) | 3:35-3:55 pm |
| 7. Approve final Plan Table of contents (possible vote) | 3:55-4:05 pm |
| 8. Finalize HPPC presentation (possible vote) | 4:05-4:25 pm |
| 9. Closure and Evaluation | 4:25-4:30 pm |

The next meeting will be November 6, 2003

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna_Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

Members Present: Eileen Loughran, Joani Marinoff, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Tae-Wol Stanley, Frank Strona, and Hank Wilson

Members Absent: Ari Bachrach, Teresa Betancourt, Aaron Cohen, and John Newmeyer

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), Tracey Packer (AO), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: None

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

The meeting was called to order by Frank Strona at 3:07 PM. He asked members to make any appropriate announcements.

- Israel Nieves-Rivera reminded members of National Latino Day 10/15/03, which will include festivities in the Mission. There will also be some additional testing services.

2. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

3. Approve September Minutes:

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the meeting 09/04/03. There were no objections, revisions, or abstentions. The minutes were approved.

4. Report from Steering:

Israel provided an overview of the most recent Steering Committee meeting, including:

- There was discussion on how the Council will address a decrease in response to process evaluation forms. He noted that only 11 evaluation forms were turned in at the 09/11/03 Council Meeting.
- There are eight new members joining the Council in January as well as one alternate.
- There was discussion about what mentoring should consist of; including helping new members understand the chapters of the Plan.
- There was discussion regarding UCHAPS.
 - ⇒ The Council will vote on new representation.
 - ⇒ He noted that this organization becomes more important to the Council if things get tough in Washington and therefore at the CDC.
- Frank Strona noted that there was also discussion at the Steering Committee meeting regarding the State of California's revised budgeting format.
 - ⇒ There is a proposal that counties that have never had a case of AIDS do not receive prevention funding.
 - ⇒ Israel added that the State is looking at a new formula in which counties would have to match funds appropriated, with the belief counties without need would not accept funds.
- Frank reported on the joint Council's Prevention with Positives Working Group.
 - ⇒ They have come up with a definition of Prevention for Positives, which was reviewed by the Steering Committee.
 - ⇒ The next step will be for the Working Group to meet again and finish the definition.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

October 2, 2003

- Israel noted that the definition is not just a prevention issue.
 - ⇒ Frank stated that the Working Group would next work on establishing standards.
 - Israel stated that the Steering Committee will propose to the Council a consolidation of the issues in the Parking Lot.
 - Israel also noted that Steven Tierney would send out information to members asking for input to help shape the SF Leadership Initiative letter.
 - ⇒ Dara asked about including the letter in the Plan.
 - ⇒ Israel indicated that it should at least be referenced.
 - Frank suggested including it in front of the Plan's Introduction.
 - ⇒ Dara explained that the draft of the Introduction chapter mentions SF's historic leadership role dealing with AIDS including in the political arena.
 - She added that the SF Leadership Initiative is mentioned in this context.
- Tracey suggested and there was general agreement in the Committee that the SF Leadership Initiative should be discussed in the Plan's Introduction chapter.

- Tracey noted that Steven will call a meeting of all of the directly funded programs to discuss the SF Leadership Initiative, date TBD.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that there would also be a meeting of all non-profits to discuss applying for direct funding, date TBD.
 - ⇒ Frank added that both meetings are intended to promote collaborations.
 - Strategic priorities, Israel added, need to be coordinated.

5. Committee Co-chair election

Frank stated that Aaron Cohen has had to step down as Committee Co-chair of this Committee. Joani Marinoff was nominated and her nomination was seconded. There were no other nominations. She was elected unanimously.

- She asked staff to provide a copy of the laminated sheet summarizing "*Roberts Rules of Order*" used at Council meetings for committee meetings.
- Discussion followed regarding the value of using these rules of procedures in Committee.

6. Discuss CSA Chapter

Dara opened the discussion of the CSA chapter by checking that members had received the draft via mail.

- Rather than reading the draft cover to cover she asked each member to review the subchapters in which they have expertise.
- Member should be prepared to provide their input, she suggested, at the next Committee meeting (11/06/03).
- She distributed a sign-up sheet for members to indicate which of the 20 subchapters they would be most comfortable reviewing.

It was suggested and generally agreed, to assign absent members subsections based on knowledge of their background.

- ⇒ Frank stated that he doesn't have preference and would just as soon be assigned.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

October 2, 2003

Dara suggested that the CSA chapter be renamed, as it doesn't really deal with an assessment of community service, and proposed renaming it the, "*Needs Assessment*" chapter.

- Joani suggested, "*Community Assessment*."
- Israel said that this chapter is really about how the Council sets its priorities.
 - ⇒ He stated that he wasn't sure what the wording of the title should be but suggested it be about assigning priorities.
- The group decided that the chapter will now be referred to as the CA (Community Assessment) chapter.
- Dara suggested starting with the Table of Contents section and coming back to this issue. There was general agreement with reviewing the Table of Contents first and returning to the CA chapter.

Dara proposed dedicating the next meeting (11/06/03) to reviewing members' input on the CA's subchapters.

- ⇒ She pointed out that the Committee would still have the 12/04/03 meeting to polish the chapter before submitting it to the Council 12/11/03).

Dara asked for overall comments on the draft CA chapter.

- Israel noted that not all activities within a group or BRP have equal risk, and cautioned against gay men seeing their sexuality as dirty.
- Frank stated it is difficult to read without context.
 - ⇒ Dara said that she would attempt to simplify and ensure that assumptions are explained.
- Joani stated that there may be an unclear message about priorities.
 - ⇒ Gay men and African-American women are both prioritized, she noted.
 - Gay men, she pointed out, are prioritized due to the number living with AIDS.
 - African-American woman because of the percentage of prevalence within a BRP.
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol and Israel agreed that this is confusing.
- Joani also said that it needs to be easier for people to find the populations they work with.
 - ⇒ Dara stated that she would make it clearer where prioritized populations are discussed.
- Joani followed up by asking if African-American women are, in fact, prioritized.
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol stated that the data indicates that African-American and Women of Color are disproportionately affected.
 - ⇒ Dara added that 6% of AIDS incidence is among women, however, 66% of the women affected are Women of Color, and one half of those are African-American.
 - Tae-Wol indicated that it isn't known if this is the tip of the iceberg, but that it is clear this number is out of proportion.
 - ⇒ Israel asked what the percentage of those testing positive for STDs are African-American.
 - The national statistics, he added, shows African-American women are ten times as likely to test positive.
- Joani then asked what is really known about Reinfection and/or Super-infection.
 - ⇒ Dara stated that she would lookup the most recent data.
 - ⇒ Israel pointed out the importance of this issue to Positive men having sex with other Positive men.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

October 2, 2003

- ⇒ Hank Wilson suggested Reinfection and Super-Infection become a research priority along with Drug-resistant virus.
 - Joani stated that the Plan should be clear about what is known and what isn't.
- Hank added that the "Mix Study" should be referenced.
- Hank also asked about priorities for future research.
- Israel asked if helping positives reduce the spread of HIV is 'Prevention for Positives' first priority.
- Israel also asked about the "Down low" population.
 - ⇒ Dara said that it was referred to in the heterosexually identified population.
 - ⇒ Frank pointed out a recent study among Positive heterosexuals.
 - ⇒ Israel stated that he is concerned about terms that fuel homophobia.
 - ⇒ Frank added concern regarding the use of the term, "Bare-backing."

Dara asked if there are strategies and interventions that are prioritized such as Outreach, Prevention Case Management (PCM), and Prevention for Positives.

- ⇒ She noted that Testing and Counseling are automatically a priority.
- ⇒ She added that the Plan Policies Committee is working on interventions, but that this group's input would be appreciated.
- Hank suggested treatment for Speed addiction becomes a prioritized intervention.
- Hank also suggest that Social Marketing be prioritized.
- Israel asked what Outreach includes.
- Hank stated that PCM should impact both individuals and communities.
- Tracey noted that he Council has always had several prioritized interventions.

7. Approval final Plan Table of contents.

Dara distributed copies of the document entitled, "DRAFT Table of Contents 2004 HIV Prevention Plan" a copy of which is available upon request. She provided some explanation of the document's layout.

- Frank asked why Epidemiologic Profiles (SIII, Chp. 4) comes before Strategies and Interventions (SIII, Chp. 5).
 - ⇒ Dara stated that in the past the Epidemiologic Profiles chapter (Epi chapter) has been the centerpiece of Plan document, but that it is not emphasized in the 2004 Plan.
- Israel stated that he is against the Epi chapter being in the third section and suggested it be with the CA chapter and Priority Populations (SII).
 - ⇒ He noted that both the CA and the Priority Populations chapters are based on data and the Epi chapter outlines the hard data.
 - The data, he added, defines where the Plan is concentrating.
- Israel also said that he likes Strategies and Interventions (SIII, Chp. 5) and Evaluation (SIII, Chp. 6) together in the same section because they are linked.
 - ⇒ Joani stated her agreement with Israel's comments.
- Joani then pointed out a paradox in public health:
 - It's not who you are it is what you do.
 - But there is so much that needs doing disparity develops in health services.
 - So, it does matter who you are.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

October 2, 2003

- ⇒ She added that this is very difficult for people to understand, as it is one of those situations in which two different things are true.
- Dara suggested moving the Epi chapter to the Introduction (SI), as it links well with the State of the Epidemic (Chp. 1, A).
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol agreed noting that the State of the Epidemic information comes from epidemiology.
- Israel stated that there needs to be technical assistance regarding how to use the Plan.
 - ⇒ He pointed out, for instance, the idea of BRPs is often challenging.
 - ⇒ The Plan needs to reach people without requiring them to be technically proficient.
- Joani stated that she likes the Epi chapter in the Prevention Priorities section (SII).
 - ⇒ She added that it is really difficult to understand the Epi chapter.
 - ⇒ She suggested the CA (SII, Chp. 2) be the lead in to the Epi chapter.
 - She further suggested having the Epi chapter as the third chapter in that section.
- Dara noted that the Plan Policies Committee would also be looking at the Table of Contents and the order of the sections and chapters.
 - ⇒ She also suggested this Committee accept Joani's suggestion of moving the Epi chapter to the second section (it would become SII, Chp. 4).

There was general agreement in the Committee on moving the Epi chapter to be the final chapter in the Prevention Priorities section.

8. Finalize HPPC presentation

Dara noted that there are two presentations scheduled for the upcoming Council meeting 10/09/03:

1. "*The 2004 Plan: Preparing for the Next Three Months*" which provides an overview of the work to be submitted by the Plan Policies and Plan Research Committees to the Council during the remainder of this year for review and consent; and
2. "*2004 HIV Prevention Plan Epidemiology and Evaluation chapters*" which this Committee is submitting to the Council for review and consent.

There was general agreement that Tae-Wol would represent this committee for the first presentation, which will be done in conjunction with Thomas Knoble of the Plan Policies Committee.

- Frank noted that members need to be reminded of the importance of reading the chapters.
- Tracey said that Tae-Wol and Thomas' remarks should include comments about presentations made to the Council are members' best opportunity for input into the Committees' work.
- Israel said that he could make a statement from the chair about the importance of reviewing the chapters before the Council meetings.
- Hank suggested reminding people that this is the reason for the Council.
- Joani suggested an e-mail prior to the meeting reminding people
- Frank suggested that there should be a reminder that members priority in regard to the Council's work needs to be the whole community's agenda, not individual agendas.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

October 2, 2003

Tracey noted that on the second presentation members would break into small groups to do an activity that gives them an opportunity to use the Epi and Evaluation chapters. Hank asked about feedback from small groups.

⇒ Dara and Tracey noted the agenda includes time for discussion of the small group's work.

- It was suggested that Joani and Tae-Wol make the second presentation. There was general agreement that Tae-Wol and Joani would do the second presentation.

Discussion regarding handling the presentations to the Council followed.

- Dara noted that the Co-chairs would need to facilitate and keep in mind that not every member needs to agree to the whole of the chapter's content.
 - ⇒ She added that it is okay for approval not to be unanimous.
- Joani asked if a simple majority could approve a chapter.
 - ⇒ Tracey said that it could, but that the Council tries to reach consensus.
 - ⇒ Dara added that a 15-14 vote would go back to Committee.
- Tracey suggested the presentation review what the Epi chapter does, rather than what it doesn't do.

Dara will make revisions to the presentation based on the Committee's comments and review it with the presenters. She will not re-send a draft prior to the Council meeting.

Second Meeting in November (not on agenda)

It was proposed and the Committee members agreed to have a second Committee meeting on Thursday 11/20/03 from 4:30 to 6:00.

- Israel noted that he may be late because the Co-Chairs meeting.
 - ⇒ *The 11/06/03 meeting is a three-hour meeting, beginning at 3:00 PM.*

The 12/04/03 Committee meeting remains, but may be reviewed depending on our committee work schedule. The final draft of the Plan must be prepared to be approved at the 12/11 Council meeting.

9. Closure and Evaluation

Evaluation forms were distributed and collected from members.

The meeting adjourned at 4:56 PM

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6TH, 2003 FROM 3:00 - 6:00 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran and Frank Strona.

HIV Prevention Planning Council

Plan Research Committee

Thursday, November 6, 2003

3:00 - 6:00 pm

25 Van Ness Ave., 3rd Floor, Room 330A

San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT

NOV - 3 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

11-03-03P02:09 RCVD

Agenda

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 3:00-3:10 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 3:10-3:20 pm |
| 3. Approve October Minutes (vote) | 3:20-3:25 pm |
| 4. Report from Steering | 3:25-3:35 pm |
| 5. Update on Plan Cover and design (possible vote) | 3:35-3:50 pm |
| 6. Finalize Discussion on CA Chapter (possible vote) | 3:50-4:50 pm |
| -Review Cofactors section | |
| -Review populations | |
| 7. Review Plan Introduction (possible vote) | 4:50-5:10 pm |
| 8. Approve final Plan Table of contents (possible vote) | 5:10-5:30 pm |
| 9. Prepare HPPC presentation (possible vote) | 5:30-5:50 pm |
| 10. Closure and Evaluation | 5:50-6:00 pm |

The next meeting will be November 20, 2003 from 4:30-6:00pm

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna_Hall@ci.sf.ca.us

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 6, 2003

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Ari Bachrach, Aaron Cohen, Eileen Loughran, Joani Marinoff, John Newmeyer, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Tae-Wol Stanley, and Hank Wilson.

Members Absent: Teresa Betancourt, and Frank Strona.

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), David Weinman (Note Taker)

Guests: None.

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

The meeting was called to order by Joani Marinoff at 3:08 PM. She asked members to make any appropriate announcements.

- Joani announced that there have been several attacks at City College including one involving a transgender student and another with an outreach worker.

2. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

3. Approve September Minutes:

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the 10/03/03 meeting. There were no objections, or revisions. The minutes were approved with Aaron Cohen and Ari Bachrach abstaining.

4. Report from Steering:

Israel Nieves-Rivera provided an overview of the most recent meeting, including:

- Discussion on the new Plan's design.
 - Review of the Small Group Exercise from the last Council Meeting (10/09/03).
 - ⇒ Some members expressed dissatisfaction with the process and there was discussion regarding alternatives, including working in pairs.
 - Discussion of next year's HPPC's focus:
 - ⇒ The "Year of Evaluation,"
 - ⇒ How to connect priorities to programs that come to fruition, and
 - ⇒ The Fed's focus on their ABC's (Abstinence, Being Faithful, and using Condoms). Israel noted that SF has its own ABC's Adults and youth who are sexually active Behavioral interventions that are based on evaluation of sound programs Co-factors for HIV: poverty, homelessness, etc.
 - Nominations for Community Co-Chair will be taken at the next Council meeting.
- Israel explained that he took over Edd Lee's term and that it is up at the end of the year.

5. Update on Plan Cover and design

Dara Coan reviewed the idea of using original photography throughout the Plan document.

- ⇒ She pointed out, however, that there may be problems to this approach.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 6, 2003

- She added that the difficulties are compounded by the short lead-time.
- Israel added that one idea that has been discussed would have the front and back covers fold out allowing readers access to information such as acronyms on the back cover.

6. Finalize Discussion on CA Chapter

Dara reviewed the timeline for the chapter, including:

- ⇒ Council members need to get the Community Assessment (CA) chapter in time to read/review it before the 12/11/03 meeting;
- ⇒ Changes to the chapter from this meeting will be incorporated into the next draft, which will be reviewed at the Committee's next meeting 11/20/03; and
- ⇒ She asked for members' overall comments about the chapter.

General Comments

- Israel said that it is great work, however the chapter is so all encompassing and inclusive that it reads as if HIV devastates all populations in SF.
 - ⇒ He attributed this to the citing of data from other cities as well as nationwide statistics, which while worthwhile, does not reflect SF's situation.
 - ⇒ He suggested that national statistics be set off as possible trends.
 - ⇒ Joani agreed, adding that she found references of other regions' data somewhat confusing.
- Aaron asked about the grammar of collective verb: "*data are*," or, "*data is*."
 - ⇒ He pointed out that medical literature utilizes the collective "*data is*."
 - ⇒ The Committee reached agreement to standardize the Plan on the collective "*data is*"
- Israel stated he doesn't want to highlight PWP simply because of the CDC's new initiative.
 - ⇒ If PWP services are to be prioritized, he asserted, it should be so because the SF Council believes it needs to be.
 - ⇒ Being positive isn't the risk, he added, the focus needs to be on behavior.
- Joani suggested changing the references from "*targeting*" and to "*focusing*."
- Dara asked members to send word-smithing recommendations to her outside of the meeting.

Environmental & Structural Cofactors

- Joani asked if there was really going to be an attempt to fund all of the cofactors discussed in the prioritized interventions sections.
- John Newmeyer said that the chapter should point out that if it weren't for the environmental cofactors and problems it would be easier to deal with clients' health issues.
- Ari stated that even if the Plan can't directly address all of the environmental factors, it is good to have them identified.
- He asked about the HPPC's role in environmental and structural factors (like poverty).
 - ⇒ Dara said that environmental factors are things the Council advocates for.
- Israel stated that if environmental factors are prioritized the Plan should tell the AIDS Office how to address this with providers.
- Joani suggested some statement early in the chapter acknowledging that local agencies might not be able to fund interventions regarding all of the structural factors cited.

Non-traditional Prevention Providers

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 6, 2003

- Ari said that the chapter seems to encourage non-prevention providers to apply for prevention funding, and asked how they would know to apply.
 - ⇒ Dara indicated that part of next year's focus is Plan and RFP distribution, training, and technical assistance.
- Israel said that the intervention from non-traditional providers is different than enlarging what is meant by prevention intervention to include other issues, such as homelessness.
- Ari suggested encouraging the HPPC to work with non-traditional providers on a policy level.
- Dara will send a draft copy of the Strategies and Intervention (S&I) chapter to Committee members, as it relates to providing technical assistance to providers.

Prioritized Strategies and Interventions

- Ari stated that the prioritized strategies and interventions tables are confusing.
 - ⇒ Dara explained that while the S&I chapter details the priorities assigned to interventions the sections in this chapter could link the chapters.
- Joani suggested adding an overall list of everything that is prioritized.
- Dara said that providers would probably know more about their target populations than is in the chapter's specific section(s).
 - ⇒ Israel stated that providers tend to be reactive, and not good at collecting unique data.
- Dara suggested eliminating the lists of strategies and intervention throughout the Chapter.
 - ⇒ Committee agreed that the tables/lists should be eliminated.

The Committee reviewed the chapter by section, including the highlights noted below.

Review Cofactors Section

- HIV Positive
 - ⇒ Israel said that the section should be clearer about re-infection, is the risk infection by a different agent or drug resistance.
 - Aaron noted it is being referred to as, "*Super infection*"
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol asked about substance abuse and mental health
 - Israel stated that link between substance abuse/mental health services and prevention intervention is case management and peer-to-peer counseling.
 - Dara noted there is a section in the S&I chapter about linkages and referrals.
- Gay Men
 - ⇒ Israel stated that the section reads as if intentional '*bare-backing*' were the major risk for gay men; adding this is a hot-button term.
- Heterosexually Identified MSM
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol asked how this group was identified and was told that the data came from clients checking: "Male," "Heterosexual," and "MSM."
 - ⇒ Israel stated that being "*Down low*" is not just about keeping things secret from one's female partner(s), but also from friends and families.
 - Sometimes, he pointed out, it is the providers who are "*Down low*."
 - Providers, he continued, must understand who the "*Down low*" people are if they are to provide intervention to them.
 - He suggested clarifying the definition of "*Down low*" so it used uniformly.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 6, 2003

- ⇒ John said that there should be some explanation regarding men in this group who are also IDU - which behavior puts them at risk, and how they are classified.
- Female Transgender
 - ⇒ Joani and Israel asked why Needle Exchange impacts IDU infection but not sharing hormone needles.
 - Aaron noted that hormones are less risky as they are not intravenous, but rather sub-cutaneous or intra-muscular.
 - Ari also noted that hormone needles get dull quickly and are bigger than those used for drugs, making sharing impractical.
 - ⇒ Dara suggested the section state that injecting hormones is a lower risk, and that she will check with researcher.
 - ⇒ Joani suggested saying that transgendered females are not at the top of the priority list because the population is so small.
 - ⇒ Israel asked about the Yammato study.
- Male Partners of MTF transgender
 - ⇒ Both John and Joani questioned the intervention approach of reaching the partners through services provided to the transgender population.
- FTM transgender
 - ⇒ Dara reminded the Committee that there is little reliable research data on this group.
 - ⇒ It was noted that St. James has collected a great deal of data, but the group is unaware of their publication schedule.
 - ⇒ Dara will review the research and check for newer work.
- Women
 - ⇒ Ari said that the chapter should highlight the epidemic's differences in SF compared with the national.
 - ⇒ Israel noted that in SF there is a lot of unsafe heterosexual sex - which shows up in the high birth rate for both young African-American and Latina women.
 - Dara noted that there is data on this in the Epidemiology Profile (Epi) chapter.
 - * She emphasized the relevancy of who the unsafe sex is with.
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol suggested the rising STD rates in SF as possible precursor to HIV increase.
 - ⇒ Ari asked to confirm if Bisexual and Lesbian women are at risk on par with African American women.
 - Dara said that this is what the data indicates; adding, however, that this could be a research prejudice.
 - ⇒ Ari stated that the heightened risk should be linked to cofactors.
- African-Americans
 - ⇒ Tae-Wol stated that there needs to be consistency in how the statistics are presented.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that for African-American IDU women the primary risk is MSF-IDU contact.
 - ⇒ Israel asked about the lower use of HAART among the African-Americans.
 - There was some discussion as to whether the difference was due to:
 - * Discrimination from healthcare providers not prescribing as often, or
 - * Distrust of the healthcare establishment in the African-American community as a result of historic indifference from health providers.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 6, 2003

- ⇒ Israel stated that the cited African-American homophobia should be clarified.
 - Ari cautioned against indicating homophobia is only in the African-American community, or that the whole community is homophobic.
 - Joani suggested adding homophobia in the White MSM section.
 - Ari pointed out that African-American MSM often grew up in SF neighborhoods whereas White MSM more often move to SF as adults.
 - Tae-Wol noted that homophobia is an issue in all communities and neighborhoods.
 - * Many White MSM moved to SF, he added, to get away from homophobia.
 - Israel stated that all sections need to note where homophobia is a particular issue.
 - Dara pointed out that the impact of homophobia in the African-American community came from the recent SCAN and the chapter will be highlighted as such.
- ⇒ Dara added that she would rework the section to reflect the expressed concerns.
- Asian Pacific Islander
 - ⇒ Dara explained that Filipinos are not necessarily at higher risk but that there is a lot of information about the community because it has been researched more than others.
- Latino and Latina
 - ⇒ Dara asked what the title of this section should be.
 - There was agreement among members that it should be, "*Latino and Latina*."
 - ⇒ Israel pointed out the high birth rate among Latinas between the ages of 13-19 and suggested reviewing data from CAPS.
 - ⇒ Some discussion followed regarding the term, "*Machismo*."
 - Joani noted that the term is pejorative in the dominant culture, but not in the Latino/Latina community.
 - She compared Machismo to the Yiddish term, "*Mensch*."
 - * Aaron added that the two words have completely different cultural contexts.
 - Israel noted that "*Macho*" is often used in the community to mean, "*Top*."
 - * Consequently, he noted, "*Machos*" often don't believe they need to use condoms.
- Native American
 - ⇒ Dara reported that NAAP hasn't responded to her requests for data, but that she would keep trying.
- White
 - ⇒ In response to the note-taker's question, the Committee agreed to use, "*White*," rather than "*European-American*" as this is convention and the terminology used by the census.
- Youth
 - ⇒ Ari suggested adding something about collecting data and doing interventions and education on a wider youth population, and at a younger age.
 - ⇒ He highlighted that directing interventions and education only toward the MSM identified and/or drug-using youth contradicts young people's changing nature.
 - Dara pointed out that there has been considerable debate about generalized across-the-board HIV education for youth without resolution.
 - Ari noted that a study pointed out that "*Non-queer*" identified youth are at higher risk those who are so identified.
 - ⇒ Israel said that the risky behavior takes place at very young ages (13 and below).
 - ⇒ He suggested the committee recommend prioritizing youth.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 6, 2003

- ⇒ Dara suggested adjusting the section to encourage all providers dealing with youth to include HIV prevention.
- Neighborhood
 - ⇒ Joani said that it should be highlighted in the chapter's text that the two neighborhoods cited are where the HPPC conducted SCANS.
 - ⇒ Dara noted that statistic indicating that 60% of the respondents BVHP believe AIDS is curable may have been influenced by various news reports about vaccines that came out at about the same time the data was collected.
- Visitors
 - ⇒ Israel noted that at a recent national meeting all eight CDC funded cities reported experiencing an increase in syphilis.
 - Visitors being a means of transmission, he added, needs exploration.

Cofactors Section

Dara asked if members to send comments by e-mail.

7. Review Plan Introduction

Not Addressed at this meeting, deferred until the 11/20/03 meeting.

8. Approve Final Plan Table of Contents

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*DRAFT Table of Contents 2004 HIV Prevention Plan*," a copy of which is available for absent members upon request. She asked members to review the document, as it will be on the agenda for the 11/20/03 meeting.

9. Prepare HPPC presentation

Not Addressed.

10. Closure and Evaluation

Evaluation forms were distributed to members. The meeting adjourned at 5:56 PM

THE NEXT MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY NOVEMBER 20TH, 2003 FROM 4:30 - 6:00 PM.

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran and Joani Marinoff.

HIV Prevention Planning Council
Plan Research Committee
Thursday, November 20, 2003
4:30 - 6:30 pm
25 Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor, Conference Room
San Francisco

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

NOV 14 2003

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Agenda

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements | 4:30-4:40 pm |
| 2. Public Comment | 4:40-4:50 pm |
| 3. Approve November 6th Minutes (vote) | 4:50-4:55 pm |
| 4. Update on Plan Cover and design (possible vote) | 4:55-5:05 pm |
| 6. Finalize Discussion on CA Chapter (possible vote)
-Review Cofactors section
-Review populations | 5:05-5:25 pm |
| 7. Finalize Plan Introduction (possible vote) | 5:25-5:35 pm |
| 8. Approve final Plan Table of contents (possible vote) | 5:35-5:45 pm |
| 9. Prepare HPPC presentation (possible vote) | 5:45-5:55 pm |
| 10. Closure and Evaluation | 5:55-6:00 pm |

11-14-03A10:48 RCVD

The next meeting will be December 4, 2003 from 3:30-5:00pm

NOTE: All meetings are open to the public and are held in handicapped accessible facilities. Meeting dates and times are subject to change, please verify by calling Betty Chan Lew at 554-9492.

Know your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance: Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils, and other agencies of the city and county exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the sunshine ordinance or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force. Donna Hall, City Hall, Room 244, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102, Phone: 554-7724, Fax: 554-7854, E-Mail: Donna_Hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

DOCUMENTS DEPT

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 20, 2003

MAR 29 2006

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Members Present: Ari Bachrach, Eileen Loughran, Joani Marinoff, Hank Wilson and Frank Strona.

Members Absent: Teresa Betancourt, Aaron Cohen, John Newmeyer, Israel Nieves-Rivera, Tae-Wol Stanley.

Note: Hank Wilson attended briefly in order to bring his feedback on the chapter.

Professional Staff: Dara Coan (Harder & Co), David Weinman (Note Taker), and Allison Weston (Harder & Co), Tracey Packer

Guests: Gwen Smith, and Steven Tierney

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements:

Joani Marinoff called the meeting to order at 4:38 PM. She welcomed attendees and asked them to make announcements.

- Tracey Packer noted that the Co-chairs, Gwen Smith and Steven Tierney, were in attendance to talk about the Introduction to the Plan.
 - ⇒ She asked, and the Committee agreed, that this item be advanced in the Agenda.
- Frank Strona announced that Walden House has an opening for a full-time counselor; working with groups and individuals; but no testing. He will send an announcement by e-mail.

2. Public Comment:

There was no public comment.

3. Approve 11/06/03 Minutes:

Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. There was no discussion or objections. The minutes were approved by consensus.

4. Update on Plan Cover and design:

Tracey showed members a draft the designers submitted and explained some of the details of their proposal, including the following highlights:

- ⇒ Three photographs of communities on cover;
- ⇒ Chapter separators in brown/taupe/fawn tones with tabs;
- ⇒ Photographs of communities on chapter separators; and
- ⇒ Will not use photographs of recognizable people.
- Frank mentioned that he did not like the colors, but would go along with others who did like them.
- Joani stated that it was very nice looking.
- Dara Coan noted that charts and tables would be in four complimentary colors.
- Ari commented that the color scheme was pleasantly subtle.
- Eileen Loughran stated that she liked the "*Minimalism*" of it.
- Dara stated that there will be a process for determining which photos to use; and that there may be an opportunity to members to review a mock-up including images.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 20, 2003

6. Finalize Discussion on CA Chapter¹

Dara explained that this was members' last opportunity to make changes to the chapter before its presentation the Council (12/11/03).

- ⇒ In specific, she asked if members liked the references to the Priority Setting chapter.
 - Frank stated that he liked the references.
- Dara noted that it came from comments at the Council meeting observing there are no prioritized cofactors for the transgender community.
- Joani said that she also liked the cross-references.
- ⇒ There was general agreement in the Committee to retain the cross-references.
- Frank made the proposals for changes which he submitted to Dara.
- Joani asked about using "*STI*" rather than "*STD*" as many other organizations are doing.
 - ⇒ It was noted that the SF DPH has not as yet adopted that change in terminology.
- Ari asked about the listing of research priority, suggesting that research regarding men who have sex with transgendered folks should be prioritized (page 26).

Resource Inventory

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*Appendix 1: Resource Inventory*," (a copy of which is available upon request) noting that the CDC requires this chapter include a Resource Inventory.

- Frank suggested referencing what resource allocation means by Tiers.
- Joani suggested adding the information of Tiers and BRP in this section.

Motion was made and seconded to approve the chapter with changes as noted. There was no further discussion, or objections. The motion passed by consensus.

7. Finalize Plan Introduction

Dara explained the timetable for this item, including sending it to Council members by 12/1/03, thereby providing members with enough time to review it before the 12/11/03 meeting.

- Frank asked about the definition of "*Urban Areas*" noting that "*Urban*" has been used in several different ways.
 - ⇒ He added that SF is hard hit because it is surrounded by small cities.
 - ⇒ Joani suggested avoiding the use of the word, "*Urban*."
 - ⇒ Tracey stated that UCHAPS uses of the word, "*Urban*" as having complex issues affecting the residents of the area.
 - ⇒ Dara asked if the Plan should include, or reference UCHAPS, "*Urban Initiative*."
 - Steven Tierney noted that the Council hasn't endorsed the "*Urban Initiative*."
 - ⇒ The Committee reached general agreement to reference UCHAPS "*Urban Initiatives*."
- Frank expressed difficulty with the phrase, "*a growing acceptability of unsafe sex...*" and proposed it read, "*a growing belief in the acceptability of unsafe sex...*" (page 3).
 - ⇒ The Committee reached general agreement to the proposed change.
- Frank also suggested that the opening paragraph is too weak (page 8).
 - ⇒ Dara said that she could make it a little stronger.
- Steven noted that there are several wording issues and proposed the Committee approve the chapter, in spirit, and empower himself and Dara work on the wording.

¹ No agenda item designated as #5.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 20, 2003

- ⇒ In way of example, he cited the references to "*Health Promotion*" but asserted it would be better to add language to the effect that, "*SF HPPC welcomes the CDC to our platform; including the importance of Testing and Counseling.*"
- ⇒ He also complimented Dara on the chapter's tone.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the chapter in spirit with the caveat that Steven and Dara work on the wording. There was no further discussion and no objections. The motion passed by consent.

8. Approve Final Plan Table of Contents

Dara distributed the document entitled, "*DRAFT Table of Contents 2004 HIV Prevention Plan*," (a copy of which is available upon request), explaining that the Sections have been removed and that the Plan Policies Committee agreed with this Committee's recommendation of moving the Epi chapter to the second chapter position.

- Frank suggested dedicating the Plan to the early days of activism and the early HPPC members who put the City onto its current path.
 - ⇒ Dara asked if the dedication should use specific names, or be general.
 - ⇒ Frank suggested it be general.
- Dara suggested she and Frank work together on the wording of the dedication; he agreed.

Motion was made and seconded to accept the Table of Contents. There was no further discussion or objections. The motion passed by consent.

9. Prepare HPPC presentation

Dara noted that Loris Mattox would facilitate the Plan Policies Committee's presentation at the 12/11/03 Council meeting.

- ⇒ She pointed out that there would be three chapters to be approved: CA, S&I and the Introduction.
- ⇒ She explained the proposed method of review as splitting the Council into four groups - two groups being the primary readers of the S&I and one group each for the CA and Introduction.
 - She noted that the member composition of the groups would be preassigned.
- ⇒ She also explained that Discussion Groups would be conducted for the CA and S&I chapters prior to that Council meeting.
- Frank suggested that after the explanation, the presentation go directly to a proposal accepting the chapter, giving member the opportunity to pass it quickly rather than spending time going through the chapters' process.
 - ⇒ He referred to similar procedures used by the CARE Council.
 - ⇒ Dara expressed concern with how such would appear, particularly since this Council has not operated that way before.
 - She also expressed concern with that members would feel rushed.
 - She added that many members rely on the discussion to make up their minds.
- Tracey reviewed the Council's draft agenda for the Committee.
- Dara noted a member's request for a full copy of the Plan.
 - ⇒ She suggested having three full copies at the meeting for members' review.

HIV PREVENTION PLANNING COUNCIL (HPPC)

Plan Research Committee Meeting

Action Minutes

November 20, 2003

- ⇒ Responding to Frank's suggestion, Tracey stated that copies would be available for review in the meeting room before the meeting.
- Joani stated that not everyone is good at reviewing things on their own, and supported having both Discussion Groups and the proposed Small Group review of chapters.
 - ⇒ She also stated that many of the difficulties during Council discussions arise because some members do not read the proposed chapters fully.
- It was suggested using the Committee's scheduled time slot, 12/4/03 - 3:00 to 5:30 PM, for the Discussion Group meetings.
- It was proposed that Frank and Joani facilitate the presentation of the CA and Introduction chapters at the Council meeting 12/11/03.
 - ⇒ Both Frank and Joani accepted.

10. Closure and Evaluation

Evaluation forms were distributed to members. The meeting adjourned at 5:43 PM

THIS WAS THE FINAL MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE.

[DISCUSSION GROUP MEETINGS - Thursday 12/04/03 3:30 to 5:30 PM @ 25 Van Ness. / Monday 12/8/03 12:00 to 2:00 PM @ 25 Van Ness, 3rd floor, room 330A]

Minutes were prepared by David Weinman, Reviewed by Eileen Loughran and Frank Strona.

